DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 403 24 HE 001 002

By-Martin, Warren Bryan

Institutional Character in Colleges and Universities: The Interaction of Ideology, Organization, and Innovation. Final Report.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Report No-P-5-0248-2-8

Bureau No-BR-5-0248

Pub Date May 69

Contract-OEC-6-10-106

Note-545p.

EDRS Price MF-$2.00 HC-$27.35

Descriptors-Changing Attitudes, Comparative Analysis, Educational Innovation, *Educational Objectives, *Higher Education, *Institutional Role, Relevance (Education), *Social Change, *Values

The claim that the US has the most diversified system of education stems primarily from the system's organizational variety and not from variety at the level of basic values. Institutions of higher education are now being challenged to extend their narrow regard for diversity into complex social realities and individual actions, and to enrich this new concept of diversity by combining existing organizational structures with a variety of fundamental values. In recognition of this challenge, a research project was conducted to determine how administrators, faculty, and students defined institutional character in the present climate of social and educational change. Findings reveal that the institutions are characterized by conformity at the level of basic values and institutional goals, that diversity has been constricted and superficial rather than substantive. Current dissatisfaction with what is called the Standard (a unidimensional value orientation set by academic professionalism and expressed in superinstitutional conventional criteria of excellence) and other factors will eventually make more substantive diversity possible, such as changes in grading practices, classes, and institutional governance. The report presents case studies of 4 liberal arts colleges, 2 private and 2 state universities, with highlights of data from students, faculty, and administrators. These are followed by comparative institutional data on faculty, and general conclusions and implications for higher education. (WM)

ED0 30403

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Report

Project No. 5-0248-2-8
Contract No. OE-6-10-106

INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTER IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: THE INTERACTION OF IDEOLOGY, ORGANIZATION, AND INNOVATION

Warren Bryan Martin

Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
the University of California

Berkeley, California

May, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the title "Institutional Distinctiveness in the Present Climate of Change." Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

HE 001062

HE001 002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Every researdh project has a character of its own. In the Institutional Character study, the search for that which was distinguishable in colleges and universities revealed that which was distinguishable in researchers: where they looked and what they saw was affected by their attitudes and fundamental values. Yet these qualities were not unaffected by external contacts. The institutions studied had assumptions and objectives, traits and distinctions that in turn influenced the perspectives of the researcher. Character is the outcome of acting and being acted upon.

Research, therefore, must always be thought of as shared research, not only because its results are disseminated in some way with a greater or lesser degree of significance, not only because it builds on the findings of other projects, but also in the sense that the project is dependent on the goodwill and cooperation of those studied. Their formal contributions are the data collected in questionnaires and interviews. Their informal contributions, hardly less important, are the courtesies and services provided for visitors during the time of the project. Researchers involved in the Institutional Character study are greatly indebted to the participating schools for contributions of both types. And the character of this study was,no doubt, affected by these relationships.

The nature of the project was also influenced by the methodological and subject matter diversity within the research staff. Edyth Short, Post-graduate Research Educator, Catherine D. Lyon, Research Assistant, and Judith Wilkinson, Research Assistant, came into the study from training in the social sciences, while David Kamen, Research Assistant, and

Warren Martin, Project Director, were trained in the humanities. There was much cross-fertilization of ideas as the project progressed, but the perspectives of researchers remained in tension throughout and were reflected in the types of work done. Short, Lyon, and Wilkinson concentrated on "marginals," statistical "cross-cuts," and various methodological problems. Kamen and Martin dwelt on theoretical conceptualizations, syntheses and field applications. Differences of opinion were frequent and substantive. There were times when the project itself seemed to be a test of the perturbational theory of learning.

So, as there was organizational diversity in the schools studied, there were professional differences in the staff of the study. Yet, as there were similarities in values across types of institutions in the sample, so there were shared interests among project personnel--for example, in cross disciplinary research, in change and direction for higher education. Differences meant that similarities would be kept under scrutiny, even as that which was shared made the differences tolerable.

James Curtis and Edwin Murray were project assistants who joined the aforementioned staff for short periods of time but, like the others, made significant contributions to this report.

Dr. Joseph Axelrod and Dr. Algo Henderson read the report in preliminary draft, made useful criticisms and emendations, and then, in a demonstration of unforgettable magnanimity, read and commented on revised portions of the text. Dr. Paul Dressel, Dr. Roy Niblett, and Dr. Patricia Cross read portions of this manuscript and made useful criticisms. Editorial assistance was provided by Julie Pesonen and Julie Hurst. Moffett Hall was principal typist and occasional bibliographer. Other typists included Lilly Grenz, Ann Sherman, Rosemary Moyer, Catherine Pernish and Mildred Bowman.

All contributed to the ethos of the study as well as to its form and substance.

The words of Martin Buber express the regard and appreciation of the project director for his colleagues:

> The ones who count are those persons who...respond to and are responsible for the continuation of the living spirit, each in the active stillness of his sphere of work.

Warren Bryan Martin
May 5, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Acknowledgements i

I. Introduction

Diversity and Standards I-1

Project Methodology and Organization 10

Institutional Preconceptions 15

Theoretical Framework 27

The Development of Research in Higher Education: 31

Early Research Efforts 32

Institutional Surveys 36

The Role of Foundations 37

Educational Research 1920-30 39

Developments Between 1930 and 1950 42

Since 1950--Research on Students 43

Faculty 48

Administration 49

Research Institutes 50

Current Research on Themes Related to This Study 52

Further Details on the Institutional Character Study 55

A Glossary of Words and Phrases 56

Table of Contents (continued)

Chapter Page

Four Liberal Arts Colleges

II. South College

Faculty Perspectives on Philosophy and Objectives II-6

Faculty Perspectives on Change Efforts 11

Conclusion 23

III. Southeast College

Faculty and Student Data III-8

Conclusion 29

IV. North College

Institutional Self-Perception IV-3

Faculty and Student Perspectives 13

Conclusion 35

V. Midwest College

Faculty Data and Student Data V-9

Conclusion 22

Two Eastern Universities--One Public, One Private

VI. UniEastern

Administrative Perspectives on Philosophy and Objectives VI-5

Faculty Perspectives on Philosophy and Objectives 15

Student Understanding of University Plans 35

Table of Contents (continued)

Chapter | Page

VII. East University

Administrative Perspectives on Educational Objectives VII-10

Faculty Data and Student Data 12

Two Western Universities--One Private, One Public

VIII. West University

Institutional Objectives VIII-12

Faculty and Student Perspectives 15

IX. UniWestern

General Institutional Objectives IX-4

U-G 7

U-J 11

Administrative Perspectives on Institutional Objectives 12

The New Colleges 15

Leadership for Change 18

U-J Summary of Administrative Views 21

U-I 21

Innovations at U-I 25

U-H 29

Data Review and Analysis 44

Table of Contents (continued)

Chapter Page

X. Comparative Faculty Data: The Different and the Like

Newcomers, Libarts, Elder Siblings. Radicals, Standard Bearers X-6

"Juniors" vs. "Seniors," Ladder Rank Faculty 17

Academic Disciplines 18

Number of Publications 19

Teaching Load 21

The Different and the Like 23

XI. Conclusions

The Absence of Holistic Planning XI-8

The Lack of Value Diversity 16

The Maypole Dance (or The Dominance of the Conventional Standard of Excellence) 24

The Urge to Move--Prospects for Change 29

Limitations on the Extent of Change 32

Viable Forms of Innovation 34

Appendices

A. Faculty Questionnaire with Composite Institutional Totals (given in percent)

B. Faculty Responses (by institution) to Questionnaire Items

C. Student Questionnaire

References

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Diversity and Standards

The diversity of American higher education was the theme with which the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, began its work in 1956. It remained the principal research concern at the Center at least until 1964 and, indeed, may be dominant to this time. In this the Center has reflected a preoccupation of American educators. No theme has been more often mentioned by them as a chief characteristic of the American organization of higher education than its diversity--the number and types of educational institutions, the various curricula, the range of opportunities afforded students--these and other features have been considered hallmarks of our system. The State of California has often been cited as providing an example of diversity among educational institutions, including as it does a nine-campus university, eighteen state colleges and more than eighty junior colleges among its public institutions which, with its private colleges and universities, professional and special programs, bring the total of institutions to about three hundred. The University of California has been considered by many to be a model of program diversity--10,000 courses provided in hundreds of different fields of study for 96,000 students.

A development of special importance in recent years has been a slowly evolving shift in the American educator's understanding of this long-established theme, a shift by which diversity is coming to take on a wider and richer meaning. Heretofore, although the concept was broadly defined, it actually stood for diversity in form and function. American colleges and universities have shown great variety in size, programs, sources of funding, and structural arrangements. However, there was comparatively little diversity at the level of educational assumptions, goals and values. American schools have offered many routes to a common goal. That goal was the achievement of what one may call an American value orthodoxy--usually associated with "the Protestant ethic," although the characteristics of the so-called Protestant ethic have been shared by most Catholics, Jews, agnostics and atheists in this country. These non-Protestant religious traditions have made major contributions to the creation of such an orthodoxy, and institutions of higher education, as agents of socialization, were charged with maintenance and improvement of the tradition. Therefore, they taught a variety of means, including dissent, by which Americans were free to achieve orthodoxy's consensual end.

What was not widely recognized then, but what has now become better known, is that because means are ends in the process of becoming, an emphasis on diversity in means leads eventually to pressures for diversity in ends. This is now happening. The traditional emphasis on variety in structure, organization, methodology, and style in American higher education has culminated in the contemporary movements toward more substantive diversity in goals, purposes and values. This is not to say that these matters were entirely ignored until now--some diversity of assumptions and objectives is present in every epoch--but there seems to have been a shift of emphasis. Whereas until recently the assumption has been unchallenged that higher education should emphasize value similarities, kinship, conformity, and sameness at the level of goals, the emergence of a concern for institutional identity characterized by unique or distinctive goals can now be seen. In other words, excellence achieved through imitation seems now to be challenged by an interest in value differentiation.

In addition to the contention that this shift is being affected by the interior logic of the American tradition--constant talk about diversity is finally convincing some people that it ought to be substantive--there are also other factors influencing the current trend, some external to higher education and some internal.

It is a commonplace that changes in education come at a rate far slower than changes elsewhere in society. Innovations in medical science, for example, proceed from research to development to general dissemination in three to five years while innovations in education take thirty to fifty years. But such talk does not take into account one crucial variable. In the past, changes in education have come slowly because educators have been living under what may be called the assurance of adequacy--under the confidence that what they were doing and, albeit to a lesser degree, the way they were doing it, was trustworthy or, at least, adequate to the need.

Now, however, because of events within colleges and universities stimulated largely by the new youth movement, that confidence has been badly shaken. The basic values of the institution are under attack and are no longer assumed to be sound. Faculty as well as students are saying that under the existing system youth have too often been passive rather than active learners, that subject-matter in the curriculum has usually been inert, not vital; static, not active; at best formal, at worst irrelevant. They also recognize now that higher education has been professionally functional but socially dysfunctional. Its technocratic orientation has belied its claims to value diversity, while the emphasis on quantitative criteria for measuring success--with pressures for grades, credits, awards--has had negative qualitative consequences. Gone, therefore, is the old assurance of adequacy. Education may be finally joining modern physics in seeing a world where things do not happen precisely according to law and are not compact, governed by strict causality, or tightly organized. The deterministic world of education seems ready to give over to one of contingency, organic incompleteness and probability.

While institutional anxieties stemming from a recognition of failures are internal prods to change in higher education, there are also various external developments that affect prospects for change on campus.

Reference was made earlier to the new youth movement, a force for change indebted to the university, but one that now has become essentially an external influence, independent of the schools. One of its main tenets is that education is a concept too broad to be defined as schooling. But the movement is having a profound influence in institutionalized education. This is so because what youth do in the cities affects students on campuses, and the educational enterprise as established is finally dependent on the goodwill of the young.

Power is in the eyes of the beholder--that is an insight emphasized by student radicals. They see that the institution of learning, by its very nature a humanistically oriented entity, has no authenticity apart from the students' acceptance of it. If students refuse to agree to the tutelary relationship which has been the backbone of faculty-student contacts, the

American university as traditionally conceived fails. It is not only the learning process that requires student goodwill. Another fact of life is that the majority of educational institutions of this country are not financially strong enough to scorn student opinion--their financial survival depends on student support. They don't have the inexhaustible supply of applicants for admission presumed by the cry, "Begone with the dissidents and make room for those who really want to go to college." Most colleges, as a matter of fiscal necessity, have to be reconciled to their student clientele even more than to their general constituency.

The new youth movement is a force for change for yet another reason: This society worships youth. There are countless illustrations to show that what the elders denounce in the young today they seek to emulate tomorrow. Let there be no doubt about it, the youth have power. They have the strength of numbers, they have financial leverage, they have social appeal. Parents, politicians, professors, all want to succeed with youth, finally, because the young are the embodiment of our culture's success or failure.

There are still other influences external to education that are factors now in opening up the definition and application of the concept of diversity.

This is the time of the "collapse" of the racial integration movement, in which so much activity was based on the denial of human differences at the level of basic values while acknowledging the presence of impediments to unity caused by socioeconomic differences. That collapse has exposed the fact that not only are the socioeconomic problems going to be more difficult to solve than the early burst of enthusiasm for the potentialities of advanced technology led Americans to believe, but it is evident now that there are deeply embedded value distinctions separating citizens. Men are not, apparently, "all alike anyway"--and so, the advocates of black power, as well as reformed white liberals, are gaining adherents in their new campaign to get this country to recognize the extent of its social diversity and to accept the values of full individuation. The new radicals, black and white, are calling for a reversal of earlier conditions. The old emphasis on the eradication of social inequalities, which unconsciously promoted value conformity to the standards set by the white middle class, are challenged to yield to a new emphasis on diversity in values within uniform social opportunities.

Another factor in the emergence of the "new" ideology is the nuclear-electronic technology. While many people fear that the consequence of computer technology will be the depersonalization of human beings, other theoreticians see in the "technotronic age," with its new sources of power and new means of managing it, the prospect that man will at last be freed to be man--individual man; he will be free to work at that which authenticates him personally rather than at that which obligates him primarily to others or to things.

When the potentialities of advanced technology are viewed against the needs of an expanding human population of infinite genetic variability, one can begin to see how profoundly higher education will be affected. No matter how extensive the concept of diversity was supposed to have been in the past, that concept must be immeasurably enlarged for the future. The range of opportunities for students must be extended, the judgment of their progress individualized, the meaning of educational experiences personalized.

The radical challenge of the times, in summary, is for institutions of higher education to extend their traditional but often too narrow regard for diversity into complex social realities and individual actions and to enrich that concept of diversity by joining their established emphasis on structural or organizational variety with a heightened regard for diversity in fundamental values. It was an awareness of this challenge, with its attendant shift in emphasis, that gave urgency to the formation of the Institutional Character research project at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

The project staff was also motivated by concern for another side of the current situation. It asked whether, at this time of unparalleled physical growth and quantitative expansion in higher education, leadership is in fact available to direct changes at the level of assumptions, values and goals as well as for the more obvious physical and financial changes. It asked whether sufficient attention is being given by the leaders we have to the ends side of the means-end continuum. In connection with these questions, certain conditions in colleges and universities were regarded by the project staff as portents of trouble.

It is a commonplace observation in all sections of the country that faculty are increasingly involved in departmental and specialistic considerations at the very time that there is urgent need for them to be broadly concerned for the relational nature of disciplines and programs. Line and staff administrators, meantime, seem so enmeshed in the minutiae of the day, in greasing squeaky wheels and getting out of the way, that they seem to have no time to shape new objectives or review existing ones. Students have been disenfranchised at the level of academic governance in most colleges and universities, though inchoate student protests surely have disquieting implications for change in the distribution of power on campus. Yet most students have no sense of the whole and lack philosophical sophistication or ideological clarity. Chief administrators, presidents, chancellors, and the like are usually ready to acknowledge their responsibility for defining broad institutional objectives or for providing leadership in helping the educational community to achieve institutional character, but when a concrete issue arises it is often difficult to distinguish the operational values of key college or university administrators, or those of the institution they represent, from the values of society. It seems that they prefer to follow rather than lead.

But where are those basic values, those assumptions and objectives of the society to be reevaluated, revitalized, or even replaced? This task, educators generally say when pressed, is the work of the home, the church, and the individual conscience. Yet this is a time when the home and the church seem to be steadily losing authority at the level of norms for value judgments. Institutions of higher education may, therefore, be situated in a value vacuum. Their leadership in examining value options is urgently needed. The former loci of authority--home and church--have faltered precisely at the time when a desire for the affirmation of individuality, a concern for personal and institutional integrity, and a responsiveness to moral leadership are increasingly characteristic of the youth who are populating colleges and universities. Higher education is the new home-church surrogate of those youth and, therefore, the institutions of higher education would seem to have no alternative but to become more, not less, involved in value judgments and, indeed, in value leadership.

There is no way for educators to avoid the issues related to the problem just stated, but there are many ways to approach them. Historical precedent may shed light. In traditional Christian cultures the church and the Bible provided the authority whereby values were set, standards defined and a sense of community achieved. In other cultures, concepts of natural and social law have served as buttresses for ethical positions. Recently, the individual person has, in the eyes of many, become his own authority. Heretofore, the conscience of the individual was joined with other referents, as in the Reformation when Luther gave to individual Christians the right to adjudicate differences of official opinion regarding the standards of both the Bible and the Christian community--although, admittedly, Luther seemed more impressed by the "conscience" of the German princes than that of the peasants, or the Pope. But seldom before in history has the solitary individual been regarded by so many as capable of judging matters affecting the basic social order.

In the context of this prevalent condition, then, is it possible to have standards for a community that are more than the sum of individual preferences or to have community values based on anything more than convenience? Is the chief threat that of randomness? The Heisenberg principle of indeterminacy brought out the fact that the efforts of an observer in the physical sciences may be expected to affect that which is observed--the point is abundantly evident also in social science research--but does it follow, then, that relativism must be absolutized? While acknowledging that absolute certainty is impossible, cannot one say that provisional shared beliefs for a community are still possible? In science, in art, in education, the principle of indeterminacy is a useful concept. But what then, for education, are the answers to the questions: What do men have in common--now? And what is their basis of authority--now? The bases of standards and community were fundamental concerns of the Institutional Character project staff, as was the question of the sources of leadership for achieving such norms.

Project Methodology and Organization

Research findings are, as just implied, the consequence of the ideas that informed the project in the first place. They may not confirm these ideas, but the ideas that prompted the research made the findings possible and have some bearing on their interpretation. It is, therefore, important to indicate certain methodological conceptualizations that lay behind the Institutional Character project.

This project was conceived as an exploratory study utilizing an integrative survey research methodology. The multidimensional perceptions to be related would be those of students, faculty, and administrators in certain institutions of higher education. The Institutional Character study involved, therefore, multiple perceptions of complex learning environments.

While there were several ideas, interests, and intuitions that informed the organization and implementation of this project, no attempt was made to codify formal hypotheses in advance. Furthermore, certain key terms, such as the word "distinctiveness," were not defined for respondents in any precise way (e.g., as they might bear on innovation). Project staff believed it would be best for personnel in participating institutions to tell the researchers what they meant by the school's announced educational philosophy or by their use of such words as "innovation" and "experimentation," "character" and "distinctiveness." The desire was to know what they thought about the subject matter of this research, and, on learning that, it was the intent to state their views as accurately as possible. Project personnel were quite prepared to acknowledge that they too had perspectives on the themes under review and that they expected to indicate their evaluation of the views of others as well as state the assumptions and values that guided their own judgments, so far as they were known. Clearly staff members were interested in ideational as well as environmental factors and, indeed, especially interested in the interaction between the two--the ideational at work in the social, the influence of social forces on ideology. The learning environment was understood as complex and multidimensional, as affective as well as effective or functional, as cognitive, political and moral, in process, subject to change as well as to inertia.

The belief that an intellectual environment as well as other social forces can be internalized by an individual to the extent that he can in turn influence the external world and effect changes there led researchers to design a faculty questionnaire for use in the project which represented an "open stance." It was intended to provide the respondent with opportunities to be formational as well as informational, to work with themes or problems that are infinitely complex and to do so in a personal and open-ended way.

The student questionnaire, in contrast, was entirely a structured instrument--a condition determined by the need to satisfy the interests of several research projects within budgetary limitations imposed upon all.

At the administrative level no questionnaire was supplied and the information received from participants was gained entirely through interviews.

There were methodological risks in this procedure, but these risks were seen as no greater, although different, than those in more structured techniques.

In selecting colleges and universities for participation in the Institutional Character study, no attempt was made to secure schools that would collectively represent the full spectrum of American higher education. Nor was the sample random. Schools participating in this study were selected, rather, because they have recently been characterized by one or both of two developments: they were in the process of substantive change or were involved in some variation of the cluster college plan. The changes might have to do with size and facilities, constituencies and programs, particular innovations or efforts at experimentation. However, regardless of the form of change or how it was defined, participating colleges and universities were places where it seemed likely, in the opinion of campus participants as well as the research staff, that changes under way there would affect the character of the institution.

The cluster college concept, whereby a university authorizes establishment of a comparatively small and in some measure autonomous unit within the general structure of the university, has drawn considerable attention in recent years as one way to solve the problems of large size and impersonality. In addition to being curious about the way this idea was being expressed and received, project staff saw in the cluster college plan a situation that could be used for program comparisons, either on the same campus or with other segments of a multicampus university.

Many more institutions than those actually selected for the study meet the two general criteria specified above. There were, obviously, other factors influencing the selection of those schools actually studied, including a desire for wide geographical representation in the sample and an interest in having the sample include both colleges and universities as well as public and private institutions. Representation of large and small schools was another consideration, as was evidence of strong individual leadership as a factor in institutional change.

In the initial organization of the research project, summer 1966, three private liberal arts colleges, two private universities of medium to small size, and one large state university were included in the institutional sample. Four campuses of the public, multi-campus university were specified. In the spring of 1967, after the student and faculty questionnaires had been distributed at the campuses mentioned above, it was decided that the interests of the research effort would be served by adding another independent liberal arts college, one openly committed to major innovations, and a state university in another section of the country that was pledged to expansion via the organization of new and innovative undergraduate colleges. This was done. The time of addition precluded student contacts, but the study was conducted in the usual manner in two such institutions at the faculty and administrative levels. Within each of the universities enlisted for the study, therefore, were subunits or colleges that were treated separately because of the interests of both the project and the institution in the cluster college concept or the idea of federated colleges.

Because of the desire to share project data with the leadership of participating institutions at the earliest opportunity, and also because of the need to have the impressions and conclusions of project personnel checked by institutional representatives, a preliminary report was written for each school and these individual campus reports, along with an introduction and some comments on findings, were distributed to members of the project dissemination committee on each campus in the spring of 1968. One of the principal researchers visited all campuses in May or June 1968 to discuss this report and to draw out comments and criticisms from local personnel. Finally, in June, copies of the complete preliminary report, that is, copies containing all of the individual institutional case studies, were mailed to participating schools. Throughout these developments it was understood that the contents of the report were not for publication or quotation due to the provisional nature of the contents as well as to the fact that the actual names of project schools were used throughout the preliminary documents.

For this final report, the case study approach to individual institutions has been retained, because of the opportunity this arrangement provides for the most relevant section to be lifted out and circulated locally, but the names of participating colleges and universities have not been used. Instead, a coding procedure has been employed that designates schools by their general geographical region, as follows:

Four liberal arts colleges	1. North 2. Midwest 3. Southeast 4. South
Two private, comparatively small universities, both with two colleges participating in the project.	1. East C and D 2. West E and F
Two public, state universities; one medium to large in size, the other very large; one with two colleges in the study, the other providing four campus and several undergraduate subunits.	1. UniEastern A and B 2. UniWestern G H - H_1 and H_2 I J - J_1 and J_2

In the chapter on comparative institutional faculty data the four liberal arts colleges have been designated as the "Libarts" group; the institutions that adhered mainly to the conventional criteria of excellence are termed the "Standard Bearers"; innovative colleges showing some prospect for experimentation have been called the "Radicals"; recently established cluster colleges are the "Newcomers"; and the institutions out of which the new programs have come are listed as the "Elder Siblings." In several cases an institution will operate in more than one category.

Institutional Preconceptions

In addition to the general organizational configuration of participating colleges and universities, there were thought to be certain unique conditions at these institutions that figured in their selection for this project. At the time the study commenced, no certainty existed in the thinking of project personnel concerning the essential accuracy or necessary limitations of these ideas, but they are stated here because of the need to make clear the attitudes project staff brought to the working relationship with these schools.

Southeast College seemed to be a prime example of a Negro college in the border situation between acceptance by the educational Establishment and obscurity. It had the advantage of location in a major city and had a working relationship with certain other colleges in the area, including two that are nationally known, with the consequent prospects for financial assistance from national foundations and other funding agencies. However, Southeast had a legacy of paternalism, social conformity and academic mediocrity by conventional standards of excellence. Nevertheless, at a time of increasing attention to higher education for Negroes, Southeast seemed to be interested in change. If so, by what style and standard?

How self-conscious was the college about its future prospects? Were leaders there--faculty, students, administrators--thinking in radical or conservative terms; were they seeking excellence in traditional ways or by new tracts?

This liberal arts college was established shortly after the Civil War and has had a long affiliation with a Protestant Church. It draws perhaps one-fifth of its entering students from elementary and secondary schools which do not prepare their graduates adequately for college level work. The faculty seemed increasingly divided between an older, academically tolerant but socially stringent faction and a newer, younger group who wanted to reverse the school's tradition and tighten up academically while relaxing the social regulations.

In Southeast, project personnel saw a college that, given its associations with other colleges in the area, might gain strength by setting aside its traditional concern for autonomy and participating more actively with its fellow institutions. Could the cluster college concept be activated in a very contemporary form within this group of colleges that were among the first to join in a loose confederation of institutions? Perhaps confederation should proceed to federation?

South College was a logical choice for the Institutional Character study because it was comparatively new at the time of the project, and from its beginning had declared a determination to achieve institutional character by giving rigorous attention to its philosophy of education and to innovation and experimentation in undergraduate instruction. South was committed to making a fresh examination of important developments in higher education--the liberal arts program and the Christian college in the contemporary world. At a time of renewed interest in the place of religion in higher learning, and with student anxiety and disquietude about values and "the meaning of it all" evident on every hand, the project staff had special interest in a new educational establishment where, it was said, matters of this sort were of fundamental concern to the academic community.

No less interesting for research were South's specific curriculum innovations. This institution had put into practice an "interim term" program, making thereby a significant change in the conventional academic calendar. There was also an innovative curriculum "core" which provided a cross-disciplinary integrative learning experience for all students in the social sciences and humanities throughout the four-year academic program. (A sophomore-junior science core was also in use but, during the period of the study, had not been integrated with the other, more ambitious program.) Overseas study, travel opportunities, independent study, advanced standing and other better known, more widely used innovations were also available options.

Project staff wondered, then, about the initiatives for the establishment and development of the college; about the perceptions of what was going on as seen at various levels--faculty, student, administration; about the prospects for later or subsequent changes; and about the transfer value of facets of the program for other colleges. One of the implied if not explicit considerations in studying South was the question of why a new, independent liberal arts college would be founded in a decade when most discussion centers on merging private schools or even abandoning them.

The rationale or justification for the existence of Midwest College is difficult to find if one limits himself to a consideration of generally accepted criteria for academic success. The location of the college makes faculty recruitment difficult--graduate libraries and cultural centers are located some distance away. The college is not favored with a large endowment or generous, wealthy benefactors. This church-related college is within 200 miles of several other Christian colleges, and certain of these competitors have national reputations. Midwest's conservative theological tradition has militated against achieving the socioreligious mix in student body and faculty that is generally regarded as essential to a vital learning environment. The facilities of the college have been adequate but unimpressive.

However, developments at Midwest during the last decade made the college important for this research project. For example, department of religion personnel had changed completely. Although that department apparently still exercised great influence on the total institution, a new and more liberal theological stance--one more open and rather more malleable--was now in effect. The college's president and dean, both comparatively new to their posts, were advocates of academic freedom, intellectual rigor, academic innovations, growth, and change. There was no interest in making the college secular, but there seemed to be a determination to make the college more relevant. Greater religious and cultural diversity was being introduced through the addition of new faculty, although at the time of the study 60% of the faculty had taken their undergraduate work at Midwest or at another college of the same denomination. Despite the location, though occasionally because of it, a new group of professionally oriented young faculty had been brought in.

The student body continued to be drawn from a four-state area, with a large percentage from rural areas or small towns, but the college had succeeded in adding minority group students--more than thirty Negroes in 1967-68--and, by the use of the winter or interim term idea, students were undertaking national and international study and travel. Money from various sources, largely government loans, made possible new facilities, and morale in the college seemed to improve apace with the anxiety level of some conservative elements in the constituency.

Midwest was in the process of changing its institutional image, and what was happening there, it seemed, might lead to a change in institutional character. Project staff wanted a better understanding of the formal and informal dynamics of that process. How self-conscious were they--students, faculty, administrators--about what was going on? What were the new assumptions, values and goals that undergirded and gave direction to their efforts? Was the college interested in alternative institutional models, if these be available, or did this school prefer to strive for excellence as defined by the standards of the educational status quo? Given the college's limited resources, what changes were viable? Were there clues in this situation for solving the puzzle of the future of small, private colleges?

The fourth liberal arts college in the study was North College--a proud, long-established, church-related school that has undergone a physical and qualitative transformation in the past ten years. What happens in a college of approximately 1500 students and fewer than 100 faculty when, rather suddenly, the old ploy about "We have no problems that a few million dollars wouldn't solve" can no longer be used because that college has the few million dollars and, indeed, more than a few millions more. North has the sort of benefactor all college presidents dream about. He has given the college $25 million in the last decade, and the institution may realize as much more in the next ten years. Not only has he been generous, he has also, so it seems, been content to leave policy formulation in the hands of the college leadership.

What happens to a faculty when their salaries rise dramatically and security is assured? What is their vision of the college then? And how is academic excellence defined and achieved? By following the well-worn path laid out by elite colleges? By using new-found resources to cut new means to new ends, or new means to traditional ends? Is the spirit of community encouraged or diminished by affluence? What sort of students are drawn to such a college? Do they come only when scholarships are available to them? What does such a college have to offer them that these students could not find elsewhere? Or is the whole point in the fact that North can now supply what students can obtain in the "better" schools of the country?

Interest had been expressed by college leaders that North should become widely known for its international programs, for its innovations and individualized or personalized instruction, for its cultural and aesthetic opportunities, for a strong academic program increasingly applied to current social realities. To what extent can these things be achieved quickly? Which of them could be bought outright? And through it all, what would be the assumptions, values and goals that would be used to determine priorities and measure success? North, it seemed, had been given a unique opportunity to become a leader in American higher education. What was the college doing about it?

East University is located near the center of the most populous area of the eastern seaboard and close to four other institutions of higher education--three universities and one new liberal arts college. East has been a commuter school for thirty years, with a student body at the time of the research project whose interests seemed to be vocationally oriented and motivated by middle class values. The university's dependence upon student fees for its operating budget had in the past caused the curriculum to be skewed toward those offerings to which students could be expected to subscribe. The faculty contained a core of dedicated teachers who felt that the university's mission was to take youth who would come to them and to help these students toward their educational goals. Another segment of the faculty was oriented to the metropolitan area near which the school was located and their pattern was to come out to the campus, fulfill their lecture schedule, and return to the city. Many of these were able specialists with a strong disciplinary and professional bent. A third segment of the undergraduate faculty, it seemed to project staff, consisted of young instructors and assistant professors who were working on advanced degrees at the major universities of the area, and were teaching at East for bread and experience.

What were the prospects for a sense of community and the unity of shared purposes in a situation such as this one? What was being done to meet the challenges raised by the newer and older universities nearby? East's experimental program, here designated East-D to distinguish it from the more conventional undergraduate program here called East-C, was obviously one answer. It was a way for East to provide a "living core" or academic focal point for certain otherwise widely dispersed students. And if, as some estimates have it, 50% to 75% of a student's learning experience comes through informal, outside of class, residential encounters, this could be exceedingly important. But would students from lower middle class homes be interested in such an innovative curriculum? And if some were, what ideological divisions would emerge between the university's conventional programs and this new one?

How did students, faculty, and administrators take to the new plan and what did they think it meant for the future of the university?

The administration's second response to the competition's challenges to East's future was its announced plan to give the university a 50% residential student body. What effect would this development have, staff asked, on the character of the institution after it had been from its inception almost entirely a commuter school? Having never been burdened by cumbersome parietal rules and the plethora of social regulations that accrue to most residential colleges, how would the student life committees go about setting up a "code of behavior?" Would they be innovative or imitative?

The questions for East, it seemed, dealt both with survival and significance. The research team wanted to observe how a university met such awesome challenges. If adversity builds character, here was a chance for institutional character to show itself.

The Eastern state university of the study has been called for the purposes of this report UniEastern. Because of the focus of the research on undergraduate programs, two of this university's colleges were examined separately: U-A and U-B.

UniEastern was selected for the study because it was thought to provide an approximate parallel for the other public university in the institutional sample, and, in some ways, for the two private universities as well, due to the declared intention of UniEastern to expand and develop its undergraduate programs by the creation of semi-autonomous colleges as the other three universities were doing. So here as elsewhere project personnel were interested in the process by which priorities were determined for the new colleges, how these means and ends were communicated to various interest groups, how they were received and implemented by administrators and faculty, and, finally, what the consequences were when avowedly innovative sub-units were introduced into a long-established and essentially traditional university.

Although Dr. Nevitt Sanford and other educators were promoting the idea of small colleges on a university campus as early as 1957, West University, private and with a Protestant orientation, was the first to get the cluster college concept* under way. Plans for cluster colleges were being discussed there in 1960-61, and the university's first such college, here coded West-F to distinguish it from the long established liberal arts program here called West-E, opened in 1962. This college, and others to come later, would have a good measure of academic autonomy but no fiscal autonomy. That division of responsibility differentiated this plan from older federated colleges elsewhere. West-F would be an innovative subunit of the university. This was one of West's answers to the question of how a relatively small, fiscally limited university, located an inconvenient distance from the major urban centers of its state, could hew out a place for itself in competition with that state's omnipresent junior college system, state colleges, and multi-campus university.

The interests of the research team included a desire to see what effect the cluster college idea had on what was thought to have been a conservative faculty in a university where resources were already overextended and sometimes inadequate for at least certain of the established programs and personnel. Also, would this university have the resources, human and financial, to bring off that which it was promising? What West had been in the past seemed well known to students and faculty--a friendly, largely residential, socially homogeneous, academically adequate institution. But about 1960 the president and trustees decided that West would become a dynamic, innovative university emphasizing cluster colleges. What all of this meant for the organizational structure of the university as well as its vitality and character was not so evident. The Institutional Character study provided an opportunity to examine an institution of higher education that was, obviously, in the process of substantive changes.

---

*defined as a provision within an institution for semi-autonomous, wholistic, academic programs to function under the aegis of a central administration which keeps fiscal considerations as its primary responsibility.

About an hour's drive from West is the campus here designated U-G of UniWestern, a major public university. If West had changed radically in form and function within ten years, U-G had changed even more dramatically in size and scope. From a small campus known mainly for excellence in agriculture and home economics, U-G had become a large, diverse university complete with a commission for a medical school. Although administrators had not hesitated to expand the institution's numbers and programs, they had understandably shown a great reluctance to give up the informal and friendly tradition that for years had been epitomized by the chancellor waving from his cottage office at bicycle and pedestrian traffic through a large, deliberately conspicuous plate glass window. One interest of project staff, therefore, was to analyze the way institutional objectives were being transmitted and accepted by a growing, increasingly disparate community.

The monumental physical proportions of the development of the new U-H campus of UniWestern--involving the creation of one college per year over the span of more than a decade--was matched by the audacity of the organizational arrangement conceived for that campus whereby individual colleges were to be sufficiently free to establish their own character and ethos without loss of UniWestern's established regard for high academic standards. At U-H the colleges were expected to have an academic focus or emphasis, in the humanities or social sciences, for example. The other new campus of UniWestern, U-J, was to be similar in general organization, yet providing for larger colleges. Because of the larger size, it was hoped these colleges could be essentially self-contained units covering the main divisions of undergraduate education. U-J's plan called for clustering colleges into groups of three or four and having four such groups.

Both of these new campuses had, therefore, innovative master plans. Project staff were concerned to determine just how the various campus constituents understood their opportunities, how they defined institutional distinctiveness, and what values and educational objectives they brought to their situation. This was as important for the success of the new programs as the ability of the first planners to convey to their colleagues the vision of the future they had. It seemed important also to try to ascertain how procedures, traditions, and restraints existent on the older campuses of the university, particularly those emanating from the powerful academic senate, would impinge on the faculties and innovations of the new campuses. Campus U-H was entirely new while U-J was beginning with a strong graduate tradition and had many faculty members who had had experiences in graduate programs in approximately the same geographical location. What difference would it make to establish undergraduate programs from the top down, that is from the graduate level, as would be tried at U-J, while at U-H development would be from undergraduate colleges to graduate offerings?

The fourth participating campus of UniWestern was given the code mark

U-I. No campus of the university has had a more varied history--from female academy to teachers college, to liberal arts miniversity, and then in recent times, to general campus of a complex university system. And perhaps no campus has experienced more twistings and turnings in its avowed purposes. As a consequence, U-I was thought to provide a situation in which at least three blocs were present in the faculty--the remnant of the old teachers college, the faculty that envisioned U-I as a small liberal arts university concerned for quality, and the "cosmopolitans" with their professionalism and national mobility. How was institutional character to be achieved, given this mix? About one-third of the student body at this campus lives in apartments which are neither owned nor operated by the university. Thus, many students there are unaffected by the social restraints dorm occupants must live by. What are the consequences of these conditions for the academic life and, especially, for the assumptions, objectives, and values that various elements in the university community bring to their work? U-I has had the reputation of a "fun and games" campus or, more accurately, the "surf and sand" school. What are university officials doing to change this image? Or should they change it? Perhaps having campuses compatible with the needs and interests of various student subcultures is also a part of the university's commitment to diversity. But will the sort of faculty that the university can draw want to work in the relaxed, sensate atmosphere suggested by the image this campus has had?

All of these, then, were impressions and perspectives, questions and concerns, that the research team brought to the experiences emanating from the Institutional Character study, and which, no doubt, in some way affected their utilization of data.

Theoretical Framework

The researchers involved in the Institutional Character project assumed that institutional character would be seen by respondents to consist of one or more of three aspects of educational life. These foci provided the theoretical framework of the study.

The first and most obvious source of institutional distinctiveness or avowed character, project staff hypothesized, would be the official educational philosophy and the stated institutional objectives that were thought by members of a college or university to give cohesiveness and direction to their work. To determine these matters, the staff decided to study the literature of the schools in the project, both formal and informal documents, and then to use administrative interviews as checks on and as amplifications of printed themes. By these two avenues it was thought that it would be possible to arrive at an institution's philosophic and propositional stance, or to state it another way, the institution's formal ideology. Ideologies are, after all, still indispensable for social existence. It makes a great difference whether a college emphasizes the preservation of the cultural heritage and its maintenance and inculcation in the young, or stresses the need to add to that heritage even to the extent of transforming it. Again, when a university speaks of being a "center of service," it is important to know whether the service is understood as vocational training and indoctrination in prevailing notions of citizenship, or whether the institution thinks of service in broader and more inclusive terms, including the idea that the school may best serve society as a center of independent thinking. One assumption in the study was that such value commitments make a difference and that they can be components of institutional distinctiveness.

But there was concern, obviously, for more than the surface manifestations of institutional ideology. It was essential to determine whether faculty and student perceptions agreed with administrative pronouncements. Was the stated philosophy operationally evident as well as theoretically understood? Was the school's stated vision really contributing to the culture of the institution?

Project personnel expected, as the second of the foci of concern, that institutional character would be thought by people of the samples to be related to what often is called the conventional criteria of institutional excellence--criteria that affect students, faculty and administrators.

At the student level the conventional criteria of excellence include SAT scores, rank in high school class, and the distribution of college preparatory courses. During the college years the emphasis is on the student's identification with a subject-matter department and his success in specialization. The socioeconomic mix in the student body and student involvement in political and social issues, whether such involvement be from the perspective of prevailing societal values or from some politically deviant perspective, are important considerations for both students and institutions.

The faculty criteria by which institutional excellence is often judged emphasize training at the right places in a precise discipline, location in a department with respected specializations, and advancement through the ranks by means of work characterized by research and university press publications. Guild standing and personal mobility are also features of what is commonly called a "professionally oriented" faculty. How academic freedom is defined and protected on a particular campus and the role of the faculty in setting institutional policies and controlling curriculum change are additional dimensions of the norm.

Administrators, according to the criteria, have certain tasks to perform, professional qualifications to exhibit and, especially, a certain style to which they are expected to adhere. The prevailing administrative norms feature efficiency, order, and success in achieving the institution's "supportive capabilities," i.e., does the college show an ability to place its graduates in the best professional and graduate schools? Does the college turn out good citizens, happy and generous alumni and public leaders? A college is known by the company its graduates keep. The style dictated by present standards emphasizes that administrators should be modest, acknowledging only half facetiously, that they are an evil and, as Sir Eric Ashby put it, hoping that they might be a necessary evil. They should know their place and stay in it. Administrators are to be fiscal and organizational facilitators of institutional programs, but they are not often thought of in the conventional wisdom as educational leaders--the curriculum is to be left to the faculty's care. Presidents, for example, are to be seen with wealthy benefactors but not heard, except when announcing a major bequest. Student personnel administrators, according to the purists, are specialists but only quasi-professionals: orderly, predictable, well-mannered people who should be innocent as doves with faculty but wise as serpents with students. (Administrators are here caricatured in order to emphasize that the criteria decree their self-depreciation.)

The criteria of conventional institutional excellence seemed to project staff to be generally accepted indices of institutional distinctiveness, and it was expected that institutional character would be measured by these criteria in administrative interviews and in faculty responses to the questionnaire.

The third aspect of educational life with which researchers assumed respondents would associate institutional distinctiveness was the current national emphasis on educational innovation and experimentation. The theme of change is so much with us now that it seemed likely that the image of an institution as seen by administrators, faculty and students would be affected by it.

Innovation and experimentation take many forms and mean different things. What may be involved at a given college is a distinct shift in the assumptions, values and goals of the institution. This can lead to significant change and be a major innovation. But, of course, that seldom happens. Again, an institution may define innovation in terms of the expansion of facilities or perhaps some creative effort involving environmental architecture. It is sometimes associated with the institutional growth rate, with numbers as well as facilities, or with the fiscal base, with new sources of funding emphasized. Curriculum innovation is a better known form of change and, among most educators, a preferred way to institutional distinctiveness. Familiar expressions of it are changes in testing and grading procedures, the use of non-intellective variables in admission criteria, or opportunities for independent study. Course content changes by faculty and cross-disciplinary course arrangements for students are currently favored teaching-learning variations. Student-formed and student-led courses and student participation in institutional governance are less frequent innovations, although student responsibility for, or at least involvement in, social policy formulation is common now. The organization and administration of colleges and universities that are going from private to public auspices, from small to large size, from a certain emphasis (e.g., teacher education) to another and usually larger mission, can represent changes in degree and even in kind. Or, participation in institutional consortia, whether state, regional or national, may be regarded as innovative and as a distinguishing mark for a participating college or university.

The process of innovation, project staff believed, is influencing institutional character in some colleges and universities today. Troubling the waters even a little seems to affect the contours of the shoreline. Furthermore, increasing external pressures for changes in higher education to prepare youth for the developing Technetronic Age seems to enhance the likelihood that present innovations, however modest, will be joined soon by more radical experimentation and that the combined effects of innovation and experimentation will greatly influence fundamental institutional commitments in American colleges and universities.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH ON HIGHER EDUCATION

To put the Institutional Character project into a larger context, the following section of this report traces the development of research in American higher education, with special emphasis on those aspects of the history that seem relevant for a study of the interaction of ideational, organizational and innovative dimensions of institutional life as perceived by administrators, faculty and students. The thesis of this study is that it is on the interface between goals and their implementation in structure and function, as between ideas and the people who embody them, that institutional or individual character is achieved and made evident. Therefore, research on personality development, socialization, organizational theory, the dynamics of change, and other emphases provides contextual data for this project. In the following section most attention will be given to the earlier research and researchers, since several reports on various aspects of recent studies are available, but the purpose throughout is to acknowledge research highlights that have illuminated the way.

Early Research Efforts

Four major points of view regarding the central purpose of higher education were contending for the loyalty of academics in the period between the American Civil War and the beginning of the twentieth century. Laurence R. Veysey, in The emergence of the American university, has described them as mental discipline, utility, research and liberal culture. The first, at that time, had the corollary of social conformity and personal piety and, consequently, in an increasingly pluralistic and secular age would soon lose out. The emphasis on utility or practical education would become interrelated with research, and together they would establish a position of dominance in the first half of the present century. The concern for liberal culture with its related emphasis on general education would persist as a counterbalance to the dominant themes but would have to settle in most institutions for a supporting role (Veysey, 1965, p. 21).

The rapidly developing concern for scholarly research was guided by the spirit of scientific investigation emanating from the German universities in the nineteenth century. The institutional outcomes in America were models for scientific research such as Johns Hopkins University and Clark University. By 1900 these influences were evident at every level of educational theory and practice.

In an article written in 1931, Paul R. Franke and Robert A. Davis stated that although educational research could be traced to about 1890, it was not until the decade 1920-1930 that activities separate from those at the elementary and secondary levels became clearly discernible and researchers were giving specific attention to higher education (Franke and Davies, 1931, p. 140). However, to understand the foundations of the research movement in higher education, it is necessary to know certain developments at the turn of the century in the field of general research on education.

Educational research recognizable by modern criteria is usually said to have begun with J. M. Rice's efforts of 1894 to measure achievement in spelling by giving a uniform spelling test to elementary school pupils in a number of cities. His results were published in 1897 under the title The futility of the spelling grind. This "research" was followed over the next two years with tests in arithmetic and language. Thus, Rice made an early attempt to use educational measurements and to secure objective data. His work was heavily criticized but it was a source of inspiration to E. L. Thorndike, S. A. Courtis, L. P. Ayres and other researchers concerned for what later came to be called the scientific movement in education. (Another precursor of this movement was the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education established in 1895.)

In 1902 Dr. Rice, who had been editor of Forum, suggested that departments of educational research be attached to the United States Bureau of Education, the National Education Association, and departments of pedagogy in universities. S. A. Courtis took up Rice's challenge and through his speeches and by offering his own tests Courtis was influential in getting bureaus for distributing testing instruments established at the University of Oklahoma, 1913, Indiana University and Iowa, 1914, and the University of Minnesota, 1915. The work of these departments in their first years was largely in educational measurements, achievement and intelligence tests, but out of such efforts would come the more comprehensive institutional testing centers that are so prominent today.[1]

The United States Bureau of Education had been established in 1867 but it was not until 1910, with a congressional appropriation of $3,000, that a specialist was employed to begin work in the field of higher education. A Division of Higher Education was created the following year.

---

[1] Harold B. Chapman (1927) is an excellent source for information regarding the founding of research bureaus in colleges and universities. The founding of the bureau at the University of Illinois, 1918, was described by Walter S. Monroe (1928). Monroe also reported in the same volume on the establishment of the Institute of Educational Research at Teachers College, Columbia University in 1921 (p. 58). A number of bureaus, notably the Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University, have followed the practice of issuing annual reports that give reviews of research activities (Charters, 1933, p. 227).

Early efforts were devoted to gathering and reporting statistical information on institutions of higher education. The efforts of the bureau were constantly hampered by fear in the nation of federal influence in education as well as by financial limitations.

Behind these pioneer individuals and agencies were the contributions to the psychology of learning from the experiments of Thorndike, Watson, Kohler, and others. They produced valuable scientific knowledge on the structure of habit, the neural bases of learning, the principle of conditioned response and the importance of the goal-seeking attitude.

Also, from the efforts of these learning psychologists came concentrated study of human differences. The scientific exploration of individual differences had been initiated at Wundt's laboratory at Leipzig, 1879; Galton's Anthropometric Laboratory in London, 1882; and the Beaunis-Binet Laboratory at the Sorbonne in 1889. Findings from these centers and elsewhere led to an emphasis in research on the differing capabilities of individuals and the need to take such distinctions into account when patterning the learning process in the schools.

As study of the extent of human differences passed from speculation to more objective analysis, the growth of experimental psychology was accompanied by the development of tests whereby individual abilities and differences could be measured. Alfred Binet was a leader here. The Binet-Simon General intelligence scale was published in France in 1905 and various revisions for American usage soon followed.

In 1904 Thorndike published the first book dealing directly with mental measurements. This volume emphasized statistical methods and fundamental principles of test construction and for ten years it remained the standard guide for students of educational measurement (Monroe, 1928, p. 89). It also had implications for research on higher education, including a proposal for the revision of college entrance examinations. The contribution of Thorndike and others of the pioneer period of research was summarized in the Forty-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, as follows:

> Toward the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, Strayer, Thorndike, and Ayres made their several studies of the retardation, elimination and progress of children by age and grade. Thorndike introduced the use of statistical method in the study of educational problems. Stone, Courtis and Thorndike constructed the first educational tests and Goddard introduced the Binet intelligence test, later improved by Terman (Morrison, 1945, p. 241).

Institutional Surveys

Research of the survey type, employing simple statistical methods, was a characteristic form of investigation from the early period until about 1940. The survey has been described as:

> . . . a formal review, usually undertaken at the specific request of the governing body of the school system; it is generally intended as a complete study of all phases of a school or school system or at least as a study of one or more major phases; it is designed to secure as complete a collection of data as is reasonably possible for its analysis; it is aimed at producing either carefully evaluative judgements, or important recommendations for future development, or both; and it is conducted by persons possessing superior qualifications for both authoritative and scientific contributions in the conduct of the study (Cooper, 1960, p. 1211).

There were actually two distinct survey movements--the school survey and the college survey. Although there is no agreement among educational historians as to when the school survey movement began, most educational researchers cite the Oberlin College self-study of 1908 as the first modern college survey.[2]

The book by Walter C. Eells, Surveys of American higher education (1937) is a comprehensive source for the college survey movement from about 1910 to the second World War. Eells reported 585 surveys, classifying them according to their nature, scope and type. Not all of those listed were concerned solely with higher education but the author made clear the delimitations of each survey named. Those wholly or partly about higher education numbered 230. There were thirty-odd surveys that Eells determined to be "outstanding" (p. 219). These include the famous Flexner report on medical education of 1910, the Land Grant college study by the Office of Education in 1930, the junior college study by Leonard Koos in 1924, the study of engineering education conducted by the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education in 1923-1929, and the denominational study by the United Lutheran Colleges in 1929 (p. 220).

The Role of Foundations

"Organized research," Carter V. Good (1939) has written, "owes a large debt to the philanthropic foundations. Educational and social inquiry has been promoted through endowments for higher institutions, fellowships, exchange lectureships, subsidies granted to investigators, and through the studies and publications of the foundations themselves (p. 569)."

---

[2] D. Cooper and A. S. Barr in their article on research methods (1960), do not agree on the first school survey undertaken in the 20th Century. Barr names Pittsburgh in 1907, Cooper says Boise in 1910 (p. 1212). C. F. Eells and F. M. Heston both agree on Oberlin.

In the earliest period of research the Russell Sage Foundation was the most active, with notable contributions made for studies of retardation, the development of writing and spelling scales, and comparisons of state school systems. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Carnegie Institute, and the General Education Board also carried on studies or encouraged others in educational research (Monroe, 1928, p.33). In 1910, L. P. Ayres published seven articles in the Journal of Education describing "Seven Great Foundations." These articles are notable for the absence of references to educational research. Only the Russell Sage Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching are specifically named in this connection.

After World War I, the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Commonwealth Fund became the leading foundations associated with educational research (Monroe, 1928, p.63). Two books of importance in reporting the story of the relationship of foundations to higher education are: Merle Curti and Roderick Nash, Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education (1965), and Ernest V. Hollis, Philanthropic foundations and higher education (1938). Neither source, unfortunately, deals in detail with the relation of the foundations to research efforts in higher education, but both make clear that "foundation philanthropy's principal importance has been helping to make the college or university a center of research and advanced study (Curti and Nash, 1965, p. 236)." Hollis accurately predicted that the foundations would do more for higher education in the second than in the first third of the twentieth century but, from our perspective it is regrettable that research in higher education was slow to gain support from foundations, albeit the eventual outcome has been significant.

Educational Research 1920-1930

It was in the 20's that research on higher education became a large-scale activity. The writings of William James and John Dewey focused attention on the need for educational change and the prospects for research, while Dewey's laboratory school at the University of Chicago was an encouragement for researchers to turn toward scientific investigations featuring controlled experiments and quantitative data yet directed toward reform.

Monroe has called this decade the period of "quantitative production" in educational research. Faith in objective and statistical methods became established, research was popularized, and growing financial support came from foundations, agencies and various institutional sources. The educational research specialist emerged, attention was given to techniques of reporting research data, and formal provisions for handling research on a continuing basis were set up by institutions of higher education as well as city, state and federal bodies (Monroe, 1928, p. 46).

Of special importance during this time was the fact that research came into the service of the standardization movement by which some measure of "quality control" over American colleges and universities would be established through the use of quantitative criteria and comparative research analyses. Reference has been made to the Flexner report of 1910. So strong and influential was Flexner's criticism of medical school standards that about half of the schools then operating were driven from the field. This is especially interesting in view of the fact that Flexner had no clearly defined criteria--he was not himself a medical doctor or a college teacher. Nevertheless, his research exposed indefensible practices, and, apart from the impact of the report on medical education, Flexner's work stimulated the movement toward voluntary academic standardization in colleges and universities.

The Association of American Universities soon took up the task of accrediting colleges of arts and sciences emphasizing criteria which would prepare students for success in graduate school. Regional accrediting associations, e.g., the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, also emerged.

In these developments, as will be shown in detail later, justification was found for the movement toward professionalism with its uniform ends reached by ever more similar means. Yet it must also be said that as standardization took hold there was dissatisfaction with the quantitative criteria used to distinguish among institutions. Studies showed little correlation between the ratings of colleges by any single quantitative standard and the actual academic achievement of students. Psychological tests prepared by the American Council on Education, as well as a national sophomore testing program involving two hundred colleges, revealed wide differences in temperament and ability among college students as individuals and as groups attending different colleges. In 1918, the Pennsylvania Study conducted by Pennsylvania colleges in cooperation with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching showed similar results.

Meanwhile, examinations pertaining to college admissions were being developed, especially under the leadership of the College Entrance Examination Board. The Board had been organized at Columbia University in 1900. Gradually it collected information from research that influenced educators to place more emphasis on psychological factors in learning as well as on mastery of subject matter. A related development was the design of comprehensive examinations to test the integration students were making of materials studied in several courses under various instructors. An ancillary benefit of these tests was the encouragement they gave to the creation of new organizations within colleges. Indeed, as Fred J. Kelly (1938) observed at that approximate time, "the extensive research in the construction and utilization of comprehensive examinations is important chiefly because it has made easily possible experimentation with different types of college organization and instruction (p. 251)." Honors courses, independent study, and other new features in the curriculum emerged.

To summarize, the scope of the research movement before 1930 included the psychological analysis of the learner, examination of the educational accomplishments of students, studies on the origins and development of curricula, and surveys of institutional practices and policies. Quantitative methods and statistics became widely used, despite persistent criticism, and the scientific movement in education gained momentum. Training in the use and interpretation of statistical methods was featured in the prestigious colleges and universities although attention was also given to other techniques of research including case studies and group surveys. The general direction was away from the cross-disciplinary and holistic research represented by the Institutional Character study and toward discrete projects allowing controlled, quantitative outcomes.

Developments Between 1930 and 1950

Research in the years before the Second World War seemed to indicate that an enriched learning environment could produce a marked change in the intelligence scores of students. Interest in environmental factors grew as it became accepted that no characteristic human traits can be ascribed wholly to hereditary factors nor wholly to environment. Experimental embryologists and geneticists showed that such traits are the results of the dynamic interrelationship of the growing organism and its social milieu. This conclusion had its roots far back in the studies of Cattell who, in 1906, sought to evaluate the impact of environment on men and women of science and letters. The results of his research showed that in those geographic areas of the United States where formal and informal educational opportunities were superior a larger number of men and women in science and letters were produced.

The holistic evaluation of educational programs began with a study of the honors program at Swarthmore College in 1923. A decade later the University of Wisconsin carried out an evaluation of its short-lived Experimental College. The studies of Nelson (1938) and Newcomb (1943) were further evidence of a trend toward intensive yet broad bore institutional evaluation. Nelson's findings revealed changes in student attitudes related to learning experiences in fourteen denominational colleges and four public universities. The work of Newcomb dealt with changes in attitudes and values on one campus but it was a truly comprehensive evaluation of educational influence on students during the college years.

In the same period, Learned and Wood (1938) produced their study of diversity among students in college.

Most research, however, had an institutional service orientation. The expanding size of institutions in the 1930's prompted research on growth rates, accounting, admissions, degrees, curriculum and instruction, and coordination and administrative organization.

One of the needs of the time was the proper organization of personnel staff for the academic guidance and counselling of students. Arthur Klein's surveys of Land Grant colleges and universities showed that few institutions had a central organization for advising students. By 1940 personnel services had improved considerably, as John Russell showed in his report to the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions (1940), but he also emphasized the need for better student personnel services by including in his sample the views of representatives from industry as well as people from colleges and universities.

By World War II the division between "basic" and "applied" or "pure" and "policy-oriented" research was evident. Indeed, projects were classified not only along the specific-holistic spectrum but also by methodology employed and audience served.

Since 1950--Research on Students

In the last two decades there has been a tremendous acceleration of and improvement in research on students. However, most research has tended to concentrate on a few specific attitudes of youth, with "findings chiefly reported as frequencies for groups of students and limited attention given to the intra-individual relationships among the numerous attitudes, interests and orientations being measured

(Heist, 1968, p. 2)." There have been notable exceptions, beginning before 1950 with Newcomb's study of Bennington students, in which a number of psychological variables were involved, and continuing with the Vassar team effort led by Sanford (1962), the recent research of Katz (1967), Chickering et al. (1968), and a few others. Nevertheless, to quote Heist again:

> ...the growing abundance of research on students had been much more empirical than theoretical in design and analysis. When theory has been a part of the underlying framework, selected constructs (or dimensions), frequently not conceptually integrated, have been used instead of a (more) total theory of human or adolescent behavior (p. 6).

From the time of the Jacobs study (1957) there has been controversy among educators about the extent to which an institution, qua institution, should be expected to effect changes in student values and, indeed, the extent to which such changes could in fact be brought about in existing college and university settings. Jacobs argued that few educational institutions had much lasting impact on basic student values and those which met with success in this area were places characterized by unique programs or distinctive objectives. Dressel (1965) challenged the assumption that the attitudes or values of all students require changing. He asserted that higher education should encourage value change only in terms of "process values"--that is, those that involve ways of thinking about or attacking problems. Keeton's (1968) study of liberal arts colleges seemed to confirm Jacob's findings and, by implication, to argue that liberal arts colleges could justify their existence by being active agents of value change in the lives of students.

Most recent researchers have elected to stay out of the controversial area of what the institution of higher education should do in regard to value infusion and have, instead, simply asked whether institutional impact on human values was possible or likely. Several researchers (Bay 1962, Freedman 1965, Heist 1966, Sanford 1962 and 1967, Trent and Medsker 1968) have concluded that the collegiate institution can move the individual toward value change, specifically toward greater autonomy, tolerance, rationality, intellectual curiosity, and general personality development. While most qualify such conclusions in a variety of ways, the following statement by Trent and Medsker is representative of both emphases and conclusions. First, a statement of their emphasis:

> The study hypothesizes that personality development--growth of autonomy, intellectual interests, and enlightened self-awareness--will be most evident among young adults who persisted in college for four years and least evident among their peers who did not enter college. This is expected even with the factors of ability and socio-economic background held constant (Trent and Medsker, 1967, p. 18).

And this quote, regarding their conclusions:

> There is evidence that basic values are formed very early in life, largely before elementary school, and certainly before high school. Nevertheless, attitudes can and do change in late adolescence and early adulthood. During the four years subsequent to their high school graduation the young adults studied were found to change considerably on reliable measures of intellectual disposition and especially on measures of autonomy. The amount and direction of change, however, varied greatly according to post-high school experience (p. 318).

Some researchers in the period since 1950 have concentrated on the ability of the college or university to influence the intellectual development of students. An example is the project of Astin (1968) on "Undergraduate Achievement and Institutional Quality." The preliminary report indicates that contrary to accepted thinking the intellectual development of students is not affected by the traditional indices of institutional excellence.

The student development study reported by Katz and others (1967) in Growth and constraint in college students: A study of the varieties of psychological development, has findings that may give reasons for the disquieting data of the Astin report. For many students the academic-intellectual offerings of institutions of higher education, said Katz, do not connect adequately with their own motivations. (A theoretical assumption of the study was that success in education is affected by the extent to which an individual can utilize his impulses to help him achieve competencies, instead of having to "defend himself" against them.)

A related conclusion was offered by Sanford (1967): It is "only through individual development that a person can maintain his humanity and become truly useful in our technological, post-capitalistic society (p. xv)." The aim of education should be the development of the individual as a whole and colleges should organize their resources for this purpose. (Planning for such a total education environment, said Sanford, must be guided by a theory of personality.)

But there are other ways of evaluating environmental press and student responses, as the following studies show: Knapp and Goodrich (1952) and Knapp and Greenbaum (1953) conducted studies on the production of successful scientists and scholars. In these reports more emphasis was placed on the impact of college in producing professionals than on the quality of candidates for the degrees. Holland's research (1957) and the studies of McConnell and Heist (1959) showed that the college "outcome" is affected by student "input," thus encouraging research on the student side of the interaction between human characteristics and institutional environment.

Another research problem attracting the attention of sociologists and anthropologists has been the "campus culture," including the personal and social life of students and their informal relations with the faculty as well as the institutional framework of the college, including traditions, finances, clientele, mode of control, and their significance for student development. In 1960, Martin Trow and Burton Clark conducted a study on the varieties and determinants of undergraduate subcultures. In 1962 came the Kansas study of student culture by Everett Hughes, Stanley King's study of Harvard students, and the already mentioned Mellon studies at Vassar College under the direction of Nevitt Sanford. Many of the findings of these researchers are germane to the Institutional Character study.

In the 1950's and 1960's, sociologists, psychologists and statisticians have continued to document the diversity of the college student population. New psychological tests have been constructed, of which the _Omnibus personality inventory_ (OPI), developed at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, is an example. Similarly, the _College characteristic index_ (CCI), an instrument designed by Pace and Stern, has been used to define and evaluate general institutional characteristics and to correlate them with student needs and personality traits. The _College and university environmental scales_ (CUES) is Pace's later compressed and refined instrument for testing the complex interaction between environmental characteristics and personality types. Five factors in the campus environment are featured in these scales--practicality, community, awareness, propriety, and scholarship. Data from CUES were available to the Institutional Character study for four of the schools.

In the present period of research, there has been increased attention to the domain of attitudes and beliefs as legitimate areas for educational research. While it has long been recognized that teaching and learning involve affective as well as cognitive matters, the difficulty of defining the noncognitive and of testing in this area has deterred research. In the recent past, however, several scales designed to elicit respondents' value preferences or attitudinal orientations have gained acceptance and have helped to encourage research in these areas. One of the best known and most widely employed is the Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey Study of values. By the use of forty-five items, it seeks to delineate values in six areas--theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious. Other yardsticks for gauging values include Morris' Way to live scale, in which the person tested is given thirteen "ways to live" in paragraph-long statements; Price's Differential value inventory, whereby a traditional-emergent value continuum for the respondent is established; and the Inventory of beliefs, helpful in discriminating authoritarian and nonauthoritarian personalities (Lehmann, 1966). It should be noted that attitude and value scales are few in number, despite the instruments mentioned, compared to the many intelligence and achievement tests currently in use.

Faculty

Research on faculty before and after World War II, especially Logan Wilson's Academic man (1942), provided descriptions of the conditions of recruitment, promotion and mobility for educators.

More recently, the work of Caplow and McGee, The academic market place (1958) dealt with problems created by the competing pressures of research, teaching, and administration on the modern university professor. Scattered studies at institutional research centers have probed the career decisions, academic preparation, status, range of services and professional satisfactions of college teachers. However, student-faculty interaction, plus many other dimensions of faculty life, remain virtually unexamined by researchers. Robert Wilson and Jerry Gaff, Paul Dressel, Talcott Parsons and Gerald Platt are now at work in this area.

Administration

As far back as 1911, Frederick Taylor published The principles of scientific management, in which he advanced the thesis that administration is a true science, resting upon definite laws, rules and principles. Earl J. McGrath, in 1936, traced the evolution of administrative offices in institutions of higher education in the United States from 1860 to 1933. He found that practically all of these had developed originally out of teaching positions in the faculty. Other findings were that the master's degree was the highest held by more than half the presidents and vice presidents of his study and that the median date for the establishment of the office of dean in American colleges and universities was 1913.

Chester Barnard's research (1942) set the stage for post-World War II revisions of the principles of scientific management. The work of Rensis Libert (1961) was especially important in this connection because it was based on the findings of the Michigan Institute of Social Research. John Corson's study on the governance of colleges and universities (1960) illuminated many aspects of administrative organization and raised enough questions to occupy a generation of researchers. Francis Rourke and Glenn Brooks in their study of university administration (1964) referred to the "managerial revolution"--the trend toward scientific management illustrated by organized institutional research, the increasing use of quantitative data for policy analysis, and the use of computers for administrative purposes.

Nevertheless, college and university administrators have, like faculty, remained relatively untouched as objects for systematic research. John Gould did a study of the deanship in 1964, obtaining completed questionnaires from about two-thirds of a sample of 268 academic deans in fifty states. In 1965, Frederick Bolman studied the process followed in selecting college presidents. Yet only now are controlled research efforts being made on role perception and job conflict, personality characteristics, value orientations, status-seeking behavior and personal identification by administrators with institutional and professional assignments. The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley, is now active in research on administration as well as faculty.[3]

Research Institutes

A review of the organization of educational research in centers and institutes to the year 1964 is found in the book, Organizing educational research, by Paul Lazarsfeld and Sam Sieber (1964). These authors emphasize that most empirical research is now conducted through institutes, although important work is also done by individual scholars. They describe the variety of educational research institutes and the problems they face. For example:

---

[3] Projects underway at the Center in these areas, for which interim or final reports will soon be forthcoming, include: McConnell and Mortimer, Faculty organization and government at selected institutions; Wilson and Gaff, Studies of faculty characteristics and influence on students; Lunsford, Administrative orientations in the large university; Duster, Comparative study of aims and administration in higher education.

> The absence of a strong professional reference group among educational researchers makes it difficult to overcome the resistance of practitioners to research results. This failure of application, in turn, makes the role of client demand a critical factor in the encouragement of research and in the opportunities for feedback from the practical situation (p. 2).

Lazarsfeld and Sieber end with a series of recommendations, including ideas for "filling the gap between educational research as a specialty and the general social and behavioral sciences (p. 61)," and calling also for strengthening the relationship between the independent agencies and the universities, improving training programs for educational research, and increasing the utilization of research findings. A recent review of USOE-funded Centers was published by the University of Georgia (1968).

The conviction seems to be growing among researchers in centers and institutes and elsewhere that the success of future research on higher education will be tied to the establishment of sound theory. There is need, for example, for a theory of personality development. In 1931, Philip E. Vernon and Gordon W. Allport stressed that a more adequate concept of personality would be a prerequisite to improved measurement. There is also need for a theory of human development in late adolescence, especially concerning developmental change throughout the college years. Research indicates that changes do take place, but precise knowledge of what determines such changes is still lacking. In the social sphere the need is for theory pertaining to the structure and function of institutions in their social setting. No less important is research on learning theory.

The effects of the emergence and growth of state-wide planning and of the coordinating systems of colleges and universities are also important research categories relating to the ecology of governance and the dynamics of organizational change. Palola, Lehman and Blischke are researchers at the Center in Berkeley who are working in these areas.

Theory and practice must advance together if research is to make noteworthy contributions to higher education in the future (Sanford, 1962, p. 1009ff).

Current Research on Themes Related to This Study

Martin Trow (1964) has delineated three kinds of educational research--predictive, directive and illuminative (p. 53). Predictive research attempts to show what will result from some specific educational practice or organizational pattern. This type of research has been responsible for the considerable body of data that aids in developing predictors of academic achievement, perhaps for the use of admissions offices. The typical problem here is to find a way to improve the predictive power of school grade-point averages for college level performance. Much of the research of the Educational Testing Service has been directed to such problems and its studies have been influential in the development and justification of admissions policies at most American colleges and universities.

Directive research, says Trow, tends to intervene directly into educational practice with statements of what ought to be done on the basis of findings. The progressive education movement in the 30's used research in this way.

Unlike directive research, illuminative research seeks to avoid associating policy making with research. It embraces a great variety of studies and is represented in the work of such otherwise dissimilar social scientists as David Riesman and James Davis, Howard Becker and Burton Clark, Theodore Newcomb and Benson Snyder. Its object is to explore and illuminate the nature of educational institutions and processes--to show how student characteristics are linked to organizational patterns, or institutional policies to educational consequences. It may start with a specific problem such as dropout, faculty turnover, or under-achievement, but in the end, it tries to understand these phenomena in the light of the college as a social system, having a history, an organizational structure, a student body and faculty with distinctive characteristics and patterns of relationships.

It is illuminative research that is emphasized in several projects recently completed or coming to completion that are theoretically related to the Institutional Character study. Two that are methodically holistic have been under the general supervision of Morris Keeton: the future of the liberal arts college study (1968), mentioned earlier, and another called a governance project. The first has involved using a national sample in a search for significant purposes in liberal arts colleges—the rationale of these institutions, the implementation of rationale in programs, consequences for participants, and the transfer value for other colleges. The governance project was designed to produce a description and evaluation of institutional governance arrangements, as understood by students, faculty, and administrators, in a diverse sample of colleges and universities. Informal as well as formal dynamics affecting leadership, power, and various human relationships in the institutional context have been elicited and analyzed. Roles and the patterns of role interaction, plus their contributions to the ethos of the college or university, have also been foci of concern. In this project, as in the liberal arts college study, attempts are being made to reach across customary research barriers, both those of methodology and those of academic groups, and to illuminate variables that may be crucial in the life of the institution as a social system.

In these or any projects that attempt to deal with broad and complex issues, it is impossible to keep either the research process or findings under strict empirical control. Nevertheless, the hope, indeed the expectation, is that the results as drawn from interviews, questionnaires and observation will be not only policy-oriented but will also be true to the criteria of disciplined inquiry.

Earl J. McGrath, J. B. Lon Hefferlin, and their associates at the Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, and at Educational Testing Service, have been conducting (1967-69) the Study of institutional vitality. Their intent has been:

> ...to uncover factors of institutional life which stimulate and sustain enterprising educational development. We have been concerned why some institutions seem to be able to modify their policies and practices in accordance with new knowledge and new conditions, while others, no less well supported, seem to stay in an educational rut (p. 133).

Three types of academic organization, these researchers stated in their preliminary report, have the most direct impact on the creation of institutional vitality and organizational change: the patriarchal (centralized authority, seniority status), the collegial (dispersed authority, rotation of status), and the avuncular (featuring reciprocity of authority and institution-environment interaction.) The first type of governance may produce a periodic pattern of occasionally massive reform followed by long-term stability. The second encourages changes that tend to be small-scale, uncoordinated, and not necessarily continuous. The third type favors continuous change, with special contributions coming through the influence of "marginal" members (p. 134).

Hopefully, these various related research efforts will supplement each other and, together, add to a scholarly yet existential understanding of the nature of the institution of higher education in the present age. In a time of great change, such understanding is essential if the community of learning is to know that which deserves to endure and that which must be altered.

Further Details on the Institutional Character Study

As the preceding section of this report was an attempt to put the Institutional Character study into the context of related research, so it should be stated that the project itself has been an activity in time and its findings represent conditions or perspectives on conditions at a certain period in the history of the institutions involved. In most of the schools of the study there have been developments since the period of data gathering that qualify or perhaps radically change certain findings of the research. Because the project had to have its perimeters, it was impossible to either retest in the light of subsequent change or to keep the report open to later accretions to data or conclusions. What could be done, and what is hereby done, is to acknowledge that life in the institutions of the study is organic, that schools like people can be heuristic, that the results of the study as revealed in the preliminary report helped in some cases to effect substantive change, and that, as a consequence of all these developments, the Institutional Character study report is more a description of aspects of life in the participating institutions at a certain period in their recent history than a definitive representation of current conditions there.

The following sections of the report are organized to give, first, highlights of data from students, faculty and administrators through case studies of individual colleges and universities, then comparative institutional faculty data, and, finally, a section giving general conclusions and implications for higher education. Comparative institutional data on students have been purposely eliminated from this report because other longitudinal studies at the Center will deal with this subject. A separate section dealing with administrators was not considered necessary since comments on them are dispersed throughout the report. The factual material used as the basis for these comments was gathered through interviews rather than questionnaires. Tables appear in the appendix.

A GLOSSARY OF WORDS AND PHRASES

Although key terms were not defined in the project testing instruments, as a way of giving respondents freedom to use them in their own way, certain words and phrases appear frequently throughout this report and they should be understood to be used in the following ways:

Change--the act or process of alteration, usually conveying in the context of this study the idea of hope of institutional improvement.

Distinctiveness--the quality of being different or unique; the special character of a college or university, having to do with either structures and functions or fundamental values.

Experimentation--new means to new or "open" ends, implying "process" and a situation where conventional assumptions and goals are challenged.

Innovation--new means to established ends, implying that conventional or traditional goals and values are essentially sound.

Institution--refers for the purposes of this study to colleges and universities providing postsecondary, undergraduate educational programs.

Institutional Character--the consequence and manifestation of an institution's "integrative value system"; also that which, in turn, gives the institution its essence, sense of community and basic nature.

Value-- "a standard held with conviction" (Leonard T. Hobhouse). Such values act as a fundamental motive force for human action, be they from known or unknown sources.

CHAPTER II

SOUTH COLLEGE

At the time of the study, South College had been in the planning and operational stages for about a decade--four years in planning and six years in operation. From the first, South had had the advantage of being philosophically self-conscious. "What?" and "Why?" were inevitable questions for the new college. And there was no equivocation in the answers. South would "test the proposition that education can be both liberal and Christian."

The state synod of a Protestant church had decided in 1956 to conduct a feasibility study for the establishment of a new church-related college in their state. A group of educators and public leaders were brought together, and they issued a report emphasizing two points: 1) There was a place in the state for a new private institution of higher education, and 2) such a college ought to offer a program of high academic quality. No mention was made at this time, apparently, that the proposed college should be avowedly innovative. By 1958, the feasibility study had been circulated, evaluated, and approved by the synod, and a successful Protestant minister was named president. He invited a professor at another church-related college to join him on an extensive trip financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation for the purpose of studying current developments in higher education. The professor accepted and later became the first dean of the college.

As a result of the trip, the attention of the men focused on the formation of a college that would not only be Christian but also would emphasize the liberal arts--the dean insisted that faculty candidates be willing and able to respond to the "liberal arts questions." South would also be innovative, characterized by 1) a core curriculum, 2) an emphasis on independent study, 3) a winter interim term calendar arrangement--probably influenced by the planners of New College (Amherst) in 1957-58, though South would be the first institution to actually implement the plan-- and 4) a special emphasis on values and the search for a Christian philosophy of education. Thus innovation was incorporated almost from the beginning.

It was a matter of interest to the project research team that the catalog of South College has been and remains open and explicit about the centrality of innovations in the program of the college. Besides the usual emphasis on personal education found in the publications of most colleges, the catalog presents South as "pursuing a policy of experimentation." The college, we are told, "adopts experimental attitudes in attempting to reach its goals through unique but carefully considered means."

This emphasis on "living research" has been carried, according to the catalog, into the realm of ethics and morality. South would learn by such "research" how students can best make moral evaluations informed by the Christian tradition: "We do not presume that [South] College is the first college to assume the necessity of a moral end of education, but we are experimental in trying to find out how best such an end can be realized."

The college is unapologetic about being a "Christian community," with a vision calling for the merger of intellectual rigor and social concern. "[South] College acknowledges as primary in the search for truth a knowledge of God and of ourselves as revealed in Jesus Christ." Yet the college also asserts that its "doors are open to qualified students of all faiths." Until 1967, as stated in the introduction to this report, faculty were expected to be "evangelical Christians." General dissatisfaction among faculty and administrators caused an adjustment in the language of the professional "contracts," so that at the time of the study only the college president and academic dean needed to be affiliated with the sponsoring denomination and faculty were acceptable if "Christian."

Since South College was very explicitly emphasizing innovation and experimentation, it might be expected that the conventional standards of institutional excellence would be considerably de-emphasized in this college. Students, to illustrate, were told that they must be ready "to accept much of the responsibility for their own learning," that they should be "eager to learn" and "display unusual breadth of interest and excellence of character." The college was said to have "few rigid entrance requirements." These statements suggested that South College has an innovative admissions arrangement.

However, other sections of the literature and the administrative interviews yielded evidence to the contrary, evidence of conventional standards. We are told that the college "expects of her prospective students considerable attainment in academic subjects," and the Freshman Class Profile 1966-67, published by the college, shows 860 applications for admission with 499 accepted. The CEEB Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores profile reveals that in the year of the study, of 116 applying with 600 or higher SAT verbal scores only three were not accepted, and of 106 applying with SAT scores of 600 or higher in math, six were not accepted. A comparison of SAT mean scores for four years shows a modest but steady increase each year, with the figures for 1966 standing at 600 verbal and 588 math. The rank in class section of the Profile supports the conclusion that South has not been unmindful of standard criteria in its student selection program.

The college's involvement in another of the emphases normally associated with the standard of conventional institutional excellence is suggested by the attention given to the success (50%) of South's graduates in entering graduate or professional schools and in receiving major fellowships--six Fulbrights, ten Woodrow Wilsons, one Marshall, and twenty other assorted awards in the first three graduating classes (from a total of only 234 persons).

Faculty excellence, again measured by conventional standards, was assured at South by securing a staff 76% of whom held Ph.D's and 78% of whom had published in professional journals in the year prior to the research project.

On the other hand, South's faculty has been committed to teaching, according to the literature and administrative opinion. The faculty is called the "heartbeat of a college" and every member selected "combines scholarship and teaching to an extraordinary degree." The catalogs studied contained the full range of rhetoric found in publications of all liberal arts colleges and most universities concerning the importance of teaching.

But this institution gives evidence of extended efforts and innovative practices in teaching. The four-year Core Program for 1966-67, according to a report from the dean, was arranged to involve 70% of the total faculty in leading discussion sections at one level of the program or another. Eighteen from different disciplines were to work in the first-year class sections, fourteen in the second year, eight in the third, and five in the senior year. The aim at South has been to arrange for a faculty member to teach two courses in his own discipline and participate in the core program, in which he would lead a discussion group about twice a week and give perhaps five lectures per year. Here innovation confronts conventionality. A faculty member participating in the core program, the program which transcends departments, lectures there in his specialization. As the Dean put it, "We're not asking him to be an authority in all things, but to impart from his discipline information that is pertinent to problems, works, and periods under study."

South has made use of faculty for their ideas on institutional goals and design as well as for their disciplinary expertise. Faculty members from other institutions were active in the initial planning activities for the college, and of a total of twenty-two involved in one or the other of two planning committees, fourteen actually joined South's faculty. Thus, from the first, a large proportion of faculty knew about and were identified with the educational aims and academic program that have come to characterize the college. Administrators emphasized in the interviews that this sort of substantive involvement in the most basic considerations by the faculty had been essential to the success of the college thus far.

Financial support for South College has come from five principal sources: student fees, the state, the city, the church, and foundations or individual benefactors. The college has had a small endowment and, because of pressure to apply income to the operating budget, it is unlikely--in the opinion of at least one administrator--that the endowment will increase very rapidly. Church support reached a peak in 1963, when about 25% of the operating budget came from this source, but had declined by the time of the research project to an amount equivalent to only 4% of the budget. The budget, meantime, had doubled.

College administrators seemed least optimistic about the financial aspects of South's program. They were proud of the physical development of the campus--forty-eight buildings on 285 acres (1966) valued at $11,400,000, achieved in seven years--and their faith in the growth of the college was underscored by commitments totaling $25,000,000 within the next decade. However, the loss of a matching Ford Foundation grant ($2.5 million) due to the termination of the Ford program, a loss that must be measured in terms of its three-to-one challenge clause--or what might have been a total of $7.5 million--combined with reduced church support and a heavy indebtedness resulting from the extensive building program, have raised serious financial complications for the future. The development office has been bringing in over $1 million per year, putting South College in the top 5% of institutions in this regard; nevertheless, the financial plight of private higher education is reflected on this campus. South, at the time of the study, needed another $500,000 per year.

Measured against conventional standards and comparative records, the college has been better off economically than most liberal arts colleges but less well off than the schools in that select list of institutions with which South would like to be compared. It must be noted,too, that innovativeness has not characterized this aspect of the college's efforts. Their fund-raising efforts, and their approach to it, have been quite conventional.

Faculty Perspectives on Philosophy and Objectives

At the time the faculty questionnaire was distributed (spring 1967), South College had sixty-five full-time faculty members. The sample polled numbered twenty-eight or 43% of the total. Twenty-two questionnaires were returned, giving representation from 34% of the total faculty. The comparatively high rate of response provided researchers with a sample notably larger than the 20% of the full-time undergraduate teaching faculty that had been set as the project norm.

The first item in the faculty questionnaire was designed to measure the extent to which the institution had shown attention to and, presumably, concern for its educational philosophy and institutional objectives in the process of recruiting faculty, by emphasizing these matters in the negotiations. The question read:

FQ1 When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the particular task for which you were being considered? (Please check one.)

	South (%)
Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed, at greater length than the particulars of the job.	64
About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job description.	32
The institutional philosophy and educational purposes were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.	0
The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would relate thereto.	0

Faculty responses at South indicate that the emphasis the college has given to its philosophy and objectives, as shown in the literature and through the administrative interviews, had been conveyed to candidates for positions on the faculty.

Another item in the same questionnaire moved beyond what had transpired between the college and the faculty candidate during initial contacts, to the matter of faculty perspectives on their colleagues' concern for institutional purposes, as understood at the time of filling out the instrument. "What FQ5 proportion of the present faculty," the question read, "do you consider to be seriously concerned, pro or con, with the formal institutional purposes that are intended to give direction and character to your college?" Responses from South respondents were grouped mainly in two categories. About 46% said "Almost all" of their present colleagues were seriously concerned for these matters while 41% preferred to say that "Well over half" met the standards of the question. "About half" was the response of 9% of the faculty answering this question, and 4% thought that only "One-fourth or so" of their colleagues were seriously concerned for the college's general purposes. No one answered that "Such things are not the concern of the faculty."

The conclusion may be drawn, in our opinion, that the high level of salience for incoming faculty of the school's philosophy and objectives has been reasonably well sustained, at least to the time of this investigation. This conclusion is based on comparative data and, of course, South's record may be viewed quite differently from the perspective of the college administration. It may be a matter of concern to the college that less than seven years after the founding of South, even 13% of the faculty sample thought that half or less than one half of South's faculty were seriously concerned for broad institutional objectives.

Robert Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago and now president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California, has been for twenty-five years one of the most provocative figures in American higher education. He has been forthright and controversial, as was a quotation from him used to elicit faculty attitudes on a question related to faculty concern for general institutional purposes. The question
FQ3 was, "Is it the responsibility of the faculty to be active participants in the formulation of educational policies and programs?" Hutchins put the matter

positively: "The duty of the faculty is to formulate the purposes and programs of the university. The duty of the regents is to interpret and defend them." Faculty were invited to agree or disagree with that statement, and space was provided for qualification. The staff anticipated that respondents would probably approach the statement as a view of what ought to be and not as a description of existing conditions or even immediate possibilities. Nevertheless, the item would provide, we believed, an indication of the extent to which faculty thought they should lead in charting the course of institutions of higher education.

Responses to the quotation at South showed 59% of the sample agreeing to a leadership role for faculty, while 41% disagreed. Of those choosing to enlarge their answer, 23% expressed qualified agreement and 32% qualified disagreement. About 9% suggested various ways the responsibilities could be shared. In an institution where much has been made of the faculty's actual participation in the formulation of policies and programs, and where broad institutional purposes are emphasized, the response to this question falls considerably below the results of the composite institutional total in which "Agree" reached 80% and "Disagree" 16%. Does this suggest that the principle of collegiality is favored by the South College faculty, that they prefer a plan of shared responsibility due to positive experiences thus far, or does the result suggest that the college's interest in innovation does not extend this far and that the school's commitment to experimentation is confined, in the thinking of the faculty, to curriculum developments? It would be innovative to have fundamental purposes as well as programs set by faculty, with trustees put in a supportive role, and we wonder if this notion is too radical, or perhaps aristocratic, to gain really strong support at South. Our hunch is that this is an area of the school's program where there is little interest in innovation.

Religious orientation is one of the distinguishing characteristics in the formal self-perception of South College. The literature and the administrative interviews make it evident that the Christian tradition figures significantly in the philosophy and objectives of the college.

One item in the faculty questionnaire dealt directly with the respondent's personal religious stance and another had to do with his opinion of the institution's adequacy in shaping student values. The results from the first of these items suggested that the great majority of South faculty profess to be religious; thus, there is compatability between the public declarations of the college in these areas and the personal commitments of the faculty. The first question was:

FQ16 Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how would you describe yourself in the area of religion?

	South (%)
Deeply religious	27
Moderately religious	36
Largely indifferent to religion	9
Basically opposed to religion	0
Prefer not to answer	9
No response	14

It is worth noticing that five faculty out of a sample of twenty-two either preferred not to answer, or declared themselves "Largely indifferent to religion." The "No response" percentage was higher than at any other school. Is that a fortuitous and unimportant fact, or does it suggest that the avowed determination of the college to find out what it means to be a Christian college has made some faculty members skittish? Against this datum is that which shows this college second highest in the sample for the proportion of faculty declaring themselves to be "deeply religious."

FQ14 The item in the faculty questionnaire intended to reveal the respondent's feeling about his institution's responsibility for the shaping of student values, a matter that may relate to his religious stance, was worded in the form of a judgment which read: "Not enough emphasis is placed on shaping the student's moral and ethical values." The faculty member was instructed to apply this judgment to his own college or university, and it was expected that his answer would reflect his understanding of conditions there.

If the assumption is held that shaping students' moral and ethical values is a legitimate function of a college, especially for a college that professes to be Christian and to have a special concern for values, then South is quite successful in this regard, according to our faculty sample. About 64% disagreed with the judgment and if that figure is joined with the 4% who strongly disagreed, the total reaches 68%. On the other side, 14% answered "Agree" and 4% "Strongly agree," for a total of 18%. Perhaps the more dramatic way to state the results is to point out that fifteen persons supported the institution's practices in this connection and four did not. Three respondents, or 14%, chose "Can't say." The proportion implying that the college did emphasize the shaping of student moral and ethical values was half again as large as that for the study's composite total (46%). This college, we conclude, has been active in this area. Having no data on students at South, we are unable to report their perspectives on the matters under consideration.

Faculty Perspectives on Change Efforts

Innovation and experimentation, program flexibility, and an openness to change are also ways of measuring institutional differences and the prospects for distinctiveness. South's literature during the period of the study was replete with references to these matters, and the interviews with administrators confirmed impressions gathered from the literature that the college meant itself to be known and characterized by these emphases. But what about the faculty? Were they similarly inclined?

FQ15 To test the faculty respondent's general attitude toward change, the questionnaire carried an item asking for the individual's personal view of the following statement: "Radical technological changes in our society necessitate radical changes in the educational experience offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different." The composite institutional total for the study showed that 19% of the respondents "Strongly agree," 40% "Agree," 11% "Can't say," 20% "Disagree," and 3% "Strongly disagree." But at South College those faculty members sharing the quotation's commitment to change were more numerous. Strongly agreeing were 46% of the sample, while 41% marked "Agree." In other words, 87% of the sample favored the thrust of the statement, a total twenty-eight percentage points higher than the composite data result. At South no person in the sample strongly disagreed, although 9% disagreed, and 4% marked "Can't say."

FQ2 Another questionnaire item asked faculty respondents to rate the importance of "An opportunity for experimentation and innovation." Each respondent was asked to judge the importance of innovation for himself and for his colleagues. South faculty responses and composite institutional totals (CIT) are shown below:

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
South (%)			
Personal View	86	9	4
View of Others	46	46	0

-continued-

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
CIT (%)			
Personal View	66	28	4
View of Others	35	48	8

Tables showing the "Personal View" of the respondent against the individual's perception of "View of Others" often reveal considerable difference in these data. Generally the individual presents himself favorably, vis-à-vis the bias of the questionnaire or the prevailing sentiment of academe on a particular subject, while playing down the colleagues' position. Some specialists in survey instrument design state that a response such as "View of Others" is where the most accurate picture of the institution is to be found. There is on certain of these items a considerable gap between faculty self-perception at South and their "View of Others." Our conclusion is that innovations are favored somewhat less enthusiastically at South than the respondent's "Personal View" would suggest. Nevertheless, favored they are, because the negative response option is seldom employed on these items, especially in comparison with the CIT.

At three points in the questionnaire, faculty members were queried on specific innovations that bring faculty members together in a shared teaching responsibility. Given South's emphasis on the core in the curriculum, these items seem worth noting. One item asked about the importance for the respondent and for his colleagues of "Inter-disciplinary faculty contacts and FQ2 teaching opportunities." South faculty responded as follows:

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
South (%)			
Personal View	82	18	0
View of Others	32	59	0

Another question asked about the theoretical importance (as opposed to an actual teaching situation) of cross-disciplinary teaching, both for the respondent and for faculty colleagues. At South the data show:

		Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
FQ12	South (%)			
	Personal View	64	32	4
	View of Others	27	41	18

The difference in wording in the two preceding items seems slight. Yet the responses from the sample changed noticeably. In the second question concerning this form of innovation--and cross-disciplinary teaching must be considered an innovation given the general departmental bias of faculty today--proportions may have been lower because the language is more specific and, hence, the issue more clearly drawn. Nevertheless, South faculty members still measure up well on this index of innovation compared with the CIT.

The CIT read (both items):

		Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
	Personal View (%)			
FQ2	Importance of interdisciplinary faculty contact and teaching opportunities	41	45	13
FQ12	Theoretical importance of cross-disciplinary teaching	27	45	25
	View of Others (%)			
FQ2	Importance of interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities	17	53	21
FQ12	Theoretical importance of cross-disciplinary teaching	10	46	33

Team teaching was not especially popular with any of our institutional faculty samples, but the following table showing South's response and the CIT indicates that, again, innovation directed to bringing faculty together in shared efforts had above average support at South:

FQ12	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
South (%)			
Personal View	27	50	23
View of Others	14	41	32
CIT (%)			
Personal View	10	34	53
View of Others	4	32	52

An innovation much better received by the institutional distinctiveness project populations is the tutorial, or other one-to-one student-faculty learning arrangements. Tutorials are emphasized as a special feature of South College. Our data suggest that this formal institutional commitment had and probably has broad support in the South faculty; 73% of the sample marked "Very FQ12 important" as their response to a question asking about the importance of tutorials for them, and 23% marked "Somewhat important."

South respondents were somewhat less sanguine about their colleagues' views, with 9% of the sample stating tutorials were considered "Very important" by others, while 64% thought colleagues considered tutorials "Somewhat important." (Two reported others considered tutorials "Not important," and three gave no response on this item.)

Once again, this college takes, generally speaking, an innovative stance in comparison with the CIT, where the totals were:

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
CIT (%)			
Personal View	42	41	14
View of Others	15	53	18

One additional item from the questionnaire will be mentioned here in connection with faculty attitudes at South toward particular innovations or experimentation--subjects very important to the proclaimed image of the college. Faculty were asked to respond "Yes" or "No," with ample comment space provided, to this question:

FQ4 Should students at your college participate more significantly than they do at present in the formulation and implementation of academic policies, i.e., in establishing the content and organization of courses, in academic policy committees by student-formed and student-led seminars?

The response at South was "Yes" 46%, and "No" 54% as compared to the lower CIT response of "Yes" 34% and "No" 62%.

This question was to be answered by all respondents in the context of their institutional situation. South had not been particularly innovative, in our opinion, in such matters. Nor did most faculty care to be. An important segment of the faculty of this college was disposed to innovation with regard to student participation in academic governance, but the majority in the sample opposed such changes and apparently favored keeping students in an advising capacity, the role they played at the time of the study.

Response to a request to rank colleagues on attitude toward innovation yielded a more optimistic view of the possibility of planned change at South. At least colleagues were not seen as standing in the way of progress. The item stated:

FQ19 Please scale your faculty colleagues, as personal observation allows, on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of your college by checking one response for each item:

	Most	About half	Some	Very few	NR
South faculty (%)					
Seem to favor "change for change's sake"	0	9	50	32	9
Willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures	50	41	4	0	4
Not hostile to innovation, but unwilling to get involved personally	14	23	27	27	9
Hold to the principle that "nothing new must be tried for the first time"	4	4	0	68	9
Believe that "if it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change"	4	4	14	59	9
CIT (%)					
Seem to favor "change for change's sake"	2	6	33	55	3
Willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures	20	23	43	9	3
Not hostile to innovation, but unwilling to get involved personally	18	30	35	11	4
Hold to the principle that "nothing new must be tried for the first time"	2	8	17	65	6
Believe that "if it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change"	7	10	24	49	7

If South were truly eager to be innovative, as emphasized in their literature, we may conclude that complementarity between institutional objectives and faculty attitudes would be shown by strong support for the second option in the preceding questionnaire item--"Willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures." The returns did, in fact, point in this direction. About half the faculty respondents said most of their colleagues were of this opinion. This figure is thirty points higher than the CIT. Furthermore, only one institution in the project sample had a higher percentage of respondents willing to say as much for their peers.

Distinctiveness is most often sought by colleges and universities, not through innovation and experimentation, but by adherence to what we have called the standard of conventional institutional excellence. South appears to be as much committed to these standards, again as indicated in its literature and in the administrative interviews, as to the various mechanisms for change. A number of items in the faculty questionnaire were calculated to reveal faculty ideas on aspects of academic professionalism. The first one read:

FQ2 The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution.

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	South	CIT	South	CIT	South	CIT
Personal View (%)						
Many motivated, hard-working students	91	(79)	9	(20)	0	(0)
A sense of community	50	(36)	50	(50)	0	(12)
Opportunity for professional advancement	50	(55)	46	(38)	4	(6)
Availability of research money and facilities	50	(51)	46	(38)	4	(9)

-continued-

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	South	CIT	South	CIT	South	CIT
An enlightened, skillful administration	77	(70)	23	(27)	0	(2)
An emphasis on teaching	77	(61)	23	(32)	0	(6)
Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.	73	(66)	27	(29)	0	(3)
Opportunity to influence departmental policies	41	(52)	50	(37)	9	(10)
Geographical location	9	(33)	64	(48)	27	(18)
View of Others (%)						
Many motivated, hard-working students	77	(63)	14	(29)	0	(1)
A sense of community	41	(25)	50	(52)	0	(12)
Opportunity for professional advancement	54	(64)	36	(26)	0	(2)
Availability of research money and facilities	46	(51)	41	(34)	4	(6)
An enlightened, skillful administration	54	(48)	32	(38)	0	(4)
An emphasis on teaching	50	(32)	41	(48)	0	(12)
Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.	54	(45)	32	(41)	4	(4)
Opportunity to influence departmental policies	41	(42)	50	(44)	0	(4)
Geographical location	14	(21)	68	(59)	9	(9)

The emphasis of the college on good students and teaching is modestly supported by these data, vis-à-vis the CIT. The disposition of the college to favor a professionally oriented faculty, with research interests and departmental involvements, is also evinced, although to a degree less than the project totals--as befits a college where these things are to be balanced by teaching responsibilities and the spirit of experimentation. South College faculty were unequivocal about the importance of the administrative leadership in the formative years of the college.

Another component of the faculty questionnaire that focused on subjects usually associated with the standard of conventional excellence had the following introductory statement. The question included topics listed in the table below:

FQ12 Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues:

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	South	CIT	South	CIT	South	CIT
Personal View (%)						
Teaching in the area of academic specialization	86	(83)	14	(15)	0	(1)
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	14	(26)	68	(55)	18	(17)
Research and writing	54	(66)	46	(27)	0	(5)
View of Others (%)						
Teaching in the area of academic specialization	59	(72)	18	(17)	9	(2)
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	18	(23)	64	(60)	0	(8)
Research and writing	18	(48)	68	(36)	0	(6)

While these data show no essential difference from the CIT, the lesser attention at South to professional meetings, research and writing may reflect the school's emphasis on teaching.

The first unit in the table shows the usual high commitment to teaching in the area of specialization, and administrative interviews indicated that the college formally approved such academic specializations. But, researchers wondered whether South College faculty were especially assertive on this point because of the tendency of the core program, despite reassurances to the contrary, to draw men beyond their disciplinary boundaries? The college faculty seemed to feel considerable tension between the cross-disciplinary tendencies of the "core" program and their own inclinations to disciplinary and departmental specialization.

FQ8 The concern of administrators and faculty at South for the modifications of established norms in higher education, and their notable success regarding these matters, raises the question of the source and effect of institutional leadership. Two items in the faculty questionnaire related to this matter, one of which read, "Where have the initiatives come from for recent changes in your institution?" Four response options were provided--"Faculty," "Administrators," "Students," or "External influences (state legislature, constituency, national agencies)." All the faculty sample at South responded, 9% saying the initiatives had come from faculty, 18% choosing administrators, none marking students, and none external influences. Actually, most respondents were not satisfied with these single categories and the largest number checked faculty and administrators. Half the sample saw this combination as the initiators of change. Faculty and students were seen as an important combination by 4% and 18% checked three--faculty, administrators and students. Measured against the CIT, South faculty were usually less inclined to mark a single category, such as "Faculty," where the 9% at South contrast with 25% for the

CIT.

FQ18 The second related question read: "Who would you say has the most powerful voice in determining the educational policies, i.e., the general objectives rather than the particulars of a given program in your college? The following options were offered and respondents were asked to rank them according to whether they were first, second, or third in power.

	Most powerful		Second in power		Third in power	
	South	CIT	South	CIT	South	CIT
Trustees or regents	0	(5)	4	(4)	4	(5)
Chief administration officer of your campus (president, chancellor)	4	(20)	0	(11)	18	(10)
Chief administration officer of your program (dean, provost)	68	(18)	14	(17)	0	(12)
Division head	0	(1)	0	(4)	14	(6)
An executive committee (Please specify:)	4	(6)	4	(8)	4	(4)
The general faculty	14	(33)	32	(10)	14	(11)
Students	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(2)
Constituency	0	(1)	0	(0)	0	(1)
State-wide coordinating agency	0	(1)	0	(1)	0	(1)
Others (Please specify:)	0	(2)	0	(1)	0	(1)
No response	9	(12)	46	(44)	46	(47)

There was overwhelming faculty agreement at South that the dean of the college had the position of most authority and leadership in educational policy formulation. "The general faculty" was placed second by those who answered, although it can be seen that in general the faculty respondents chose not to respond to the second and third power possibilities. These data correlate well with those in the previously mentioned item. The leadership in determining educational policies, and for changing them, had come from the dean and the faculty--especially the former, according to the latter.

Conclusion

The general conclusion drawn from the faculty questionnaire items is that South College has been straightforward in its declaration of purposes and that those purposes had been, at the time of the study, understood by nearly all of the faculty and accepted by a majority of them.

The formal organization of the college, that is, the offices and job descriptions, the authority structure and official relationships, was not in our opinion nearly so innovative in design or conception as was the curriculum. The actual performance of the administrators might be quite innovative, but they worked, formally, whatever the informal dynamics, within a conventional structure. Thus, the record of South College shows that innovations can be grafted on to an old-fashioned administrative trunk--if the leaders in administration favor the changes and do not, therefore, reject the graft.

The crucial variable at South has been its leadership. Purposeful leadership in administration was joined with leadership in key faculty positions sharing the same aims. The combination has produced a college of character testing certain innovations that may have positive consequences for many liberal arts colleges.

CHAPTER III

SOUTHEAST COLLEGE

It was symbolic of Southeast College at the time of the study that the feature in its situation that the college might have been expected to especially emphasize--its location in and identification with a certain complex of colleges--was not emphasized at all in the college catalog.* Attention was paid to the accreditation of the college, to a review of this Negro college's history and purposes, to the expenses and provisions for student financial aid, and, of course, to curriculum, rules, grade categories and other matters of general interest. But that feature which was or might have been the most innovative one for Southeast was mentioned only in passing, while those emphases that help to identify Southeast with the American institutional mainstream were prominently featured. Southeast, we have concluded from this and other evidence, was much more concerned for adherence to the standards of conventional institutional excellence than for success with innovation or experimentation. This college would achieve distinctiveness by being a first-rate liberal arts college, as measured by the generally accepted criteria of excellence. And given the school's limitations in fiscal resources and the educational and cultural limitations of students coming into the school, this determination must be termed heroic. But is such a course of action as wise as it is heroic?

The purpose of Southeast College was declared to be "to promote broad and accurate scholarship and a high type of character. The institution invites and welcomes students of good ability, high ideals and sincerity of purpose." The catalog in use at the time of the study elaborated on this brief declaration, but there was nothing said, as there is nothing about the above statement, that cannot be found in the publications of hundreds of church-related, liberal arts colleges.

---

*Acknowledgement is hereby made that at Southeast, as at other institutions in the institutional sample, there have been changes subsequent to the period of this research project that qualify various findings. However, that which is reported is regarded as the situation existing at the time of the study.

Southeast was founded in 1869 by a Protestant Church, and from that time to the present the influence of the church has been evident. The catalog explains:

> The life of the college from its beginning has been directed by men and women of unswerving faith in Christianity. No denominational requirements are imposed on any students. It is true, however, that the authorities of the college believe that religious development is of primary importance, and that no intellectual culture can compensate for the dwarfing of the religious nature. The college stands for broad and strong scholarship and the highest moral and religious life.

To implement this commitment to the Judeo-Christian tradition, there was a weekly compulsory chapel and Sunday vesper hour, a six-hour requirement in religion and philosophy, the services of a chaplain, the church-related faculty and administrative leadership, plus rules and regulations many Christian colleges establish as "supports" for their commitments. The faculty contract, however, made no theological demands and there was no denominational quota for student enrollment.

Other features in the life of Southeast that might be expected to contribute to the "character" of the college included: an exchange program with several northern institutions, departmental and interdepartmental honors programs, and the association with certain other colleges at the undergraduate level as well as with a university and an interdenominational theological center at the graduate level. This arrangement put the Southeast student in contact, at least in theory, with 4,800 students and 420 faculty members. He could take courses elsewhere in the complex and participate in inter-institutional programs such as the Cooperative General Science project, in which nonscience majors in the four undergraduate colleges were given instruction by a special faculty selected for unusual teaching competency. There were also special programs in journalism and the benefits of the varied cultural features of the complex of colleges.

Interviews with Southeast administrators revealed that they had decided to work toward greater cooperation with the other colleges of the complex. They gave the impression that Southeast personnel were for many years concerned primarily to establish the identity of their college and the integrity of its program, and that only recently had they gained the confidence in themselves prerequisite to creative, successful efforts at cooperation with schools previously thought of as competitors.

The leadership for the college in the area of institutional objectives has come, administrators acknowledged, from the Board of Trustees and the President. The trustees had been loyal to Southeast's church affiliation and, therefore, through them the church had influenced the ethos of the college but not the academic program, said administrators. Church affiliation contributed significantly to student recruitment but the church was only moderately influential through direct financial support. Approximately $80,000 in the annual operating budget came from the churches of the state Conference. Many churchmen, one researcher was told, felt that Southeast had been and should remain an arm of the church, whereas the leadership within the college had become increasingly vigorous in asserting the independence of the school.

The preceding statement is not intended to suggest that Southeast's administrators proposed to use their independence to promote radical socio-political ideas or radical educational experimentation. The impression gained by the visitors in 1966-67 was that the administrators of the college, with the exception of the new president, who was then just beginning to be known but who was already showing signs of discomfort with the status quo, were moderates on most controversial issues. They appeared to us to be moderate on questions of race, economics, and politics, moderate regarding personal and community styles, moderate in educational expectations and program planning. They were interested in being distinctive if that meant being better by conventional standards of academic excellence than most Negro colleges of the southeast. They were not interested in being distinctive if that meant being different from the good white or black liberal arts colleges with which they wanted to be identified and who were responsible for the standards by which Southeast people judged themselves. They did want the distinction of highly regarded Negro colleges and the satisfaction of success judged by conventional academic criteria. They had too long had the "distinction" of being regarded as inferior. Thus, Southeast's administrators were interested in innovations that showed promise of moving the college toward what other administrators, in the institutions where the dominant model had long been sanctioned, were now trying to innovate away from. At the time of the Southeast study, a new spirit of independence was just beginning to emerge, but it was clearly a harbinger of things to come and not a distinguishing characteristic of present realities.

Southeast administrators wanted better students--as defined by standard criteria such as College Board scores and rank in class--and they felt that there may have been a slight improvement in these matters over the past decade. However, there were two serious problems in this connection: first, the limitations in the elementary and secondary schools as well as in the homes from which most Southeast students come are such as to make a considerable number of entering freshmen, perhaps 20% of them, capable of doing only sub-collegiate work. The 70% who failed to graduate seldom transferred to other schools. Yet the college did not want to compromise its academic aspirations enough to accommodate these students. The second serious problem for Southeast and schools in its class has been that wealthy northern white colleges compete so aggressively for the best Negro high school graduates in the south that these academically-oriented students are often lost to northern institutions. It is instructive to notice that the complex of colleges held a luncheon for high school counsellors of the cosmopolitan area for the first time in 1967 in an effort to enlist the help of these counsellors in getting first-rate Negro students into local institutions. The letter of invitation to counsellors, project personnel were told, may have been the first public document in the history of the complex to be signed by the presidents of all the colleges.

Southeast draws most of its students from the state it is in and a bordering state, from small towns or rural locales, from church-related homes of limited social and educational opportunities. The city in which Southeast is located is a mecca for such students, and they readily identify with the middle-class values of the area and the college. Indeed, their vocational and social status aspirations, combined with the educational limitations in their background and earlier experiences, limit the innovations open to the college and sustain the middle class character of the institution. Fraternities and sororities, for example, figure prominently in the life of Southeast. Some of the administrators interviewed felt that the "Greeks" were too influential and that their influence was essentially anti-intellectual. Others thought that the "Greeks" tended to lift the academic life of the community and that they fitted in rather well with prevailing institutional values--neither elitest nor share-cropper, not intellectually esoteric, but oriented to materialism and competitive capitalism, democracy, social conformity and liberal Christianity. Many faculty were said to actively encourage promising students to join. The large and successful inter-collegiate athletic program of the college also confirms and supports these values.

Southeast wants faculty trained in the better graduate and professional schools--a professionally-oriented faculty. This emphasis, which of late has become quite marked, created uneasiness among older faculty and, furthermore, probably contributed to a high turnover of personnel and the low faculty retention rate. Younger, aggressive intellectually inclined faculty saw the Council for Academic Affairs dominated by older department heads and academic traditionalists. Yet these junior faculty who are committed to strengthening departmental autonomy and to the success of their students at graduate schools seemed to visiting researchers to be rather more likely to be concerned for general institutional policy matters and certainly for broadening the committee structure toward more faculty responsibility for academic policy formulation than did older faculty.

Certain administrators, in 1966-67, on the other hand, argued that faculty members carried twelve- to fifteen-hour teaching loads, had both teaching and research to handle, and should not, therefore, be drawn into committee functions. The responsibilities allocated to faculty committees, they said, should be left to administration. They favored such an arrangement and, additionally, they believed that most faculty were of the same mind.

Students were not serving on academic policy committees at the time of our study--not even on the student discipline committee. Punishment for student social violations was meted out by faculty committees of the same sex as student offenders. Students were pressing, we were told, for representation on major policy committees, including the Council for Administrative Affairs and the Council for Academic Affairs--although as with the issue of faculty involvement, certain administrators denied that students were interested in such participation. The mood of most administrators seemed to be to limit students to advising or consultive services. Their general attitude, one not entirely shared by the new college president, was that faculty and administrators were the specialists in academic governance and that the students had the freedom "to learn." Students might become involved in social matters, but control of the academic life was the domain of the "senior members" of the community.

It may be pointed out in passing that whereas certain administrators were emphatic about Southeast students being unready for the responsibilities of leadership, certain of the students felt they were not given sufficient responsibility to even encourage the development of leadership. For example, it was mentioned that students had been assigned the task of setting up an annual budget for student government, but when their representatives took specific proposals to college administrators, what they had done was challenged repeatedly. The result was that the students concluded their work was not taken seriously and that they had not been given real responsibility in this case.

There is, of course, nothing very new about such tensions, particularly in those areas of governance where it is easy to misunderstand what is delegated and what is retained. But the project staff saw little interest at Southeast in new solutions to such old problems. There was no general emphasis on innovation. A particular program in one of the departments might carry innovative features--small freshman lab sections in biology, with senior faculty working there even at the sacrifice of time with upper division students--but, by and large, neither in the curriculum nor in social organization were comprehensive innovations attempted. Emphases were elsewhere, mainly on conventional standards of institutional excellence.

The faculty handbook of any institution of higher education is a good place from which to elicit the personal and professional values that the institution proposes to promote by its rewards and sanctions. The handbook at Southeast emphasized the criteria for faculty selection and advancement that are used in the great majority of prestigious or aspiring schools. Project staff noticed only one major exception: there was no mention of academic freedom. Presidential reports to trustees are also indices of emphasis and, here again, the conventional value structure of Southeast College was documented. One presidential report stated that 20% of the instructional faculty had earned the doctorate, and that the college was concerned for teaching excellence, research and publications, professional affiliations, and various forms of public service. From interviews with administrators and an examination of the college's literature, we concluded that Southeast, if it had any self-image, defined itself by a Christian and liberal arts educational philosophy with curriculum and social objectives that were standard American.

Faculty and Student Data

When data are introduced from the faculty questionnaire, the picture becomes more blurred. The instrument was mailed to a sample of twenty-four full-time faculty, and fifteen questionnaires were returned. This return provided a 20% sample of the total faculty.

It might be assumed that a school with only about sixty full-time faculty and a long tradition as a church-related college would effectively communicate its general institutional objectives to faculty and that they would be actively, noticeably committed to them. But such thinking does not apply to Southeast. Two items asked faculty to state their concern for institutional objectives, and the responses to both of these showed Southeast faculty to be below the composite institutional total.

FQ5 When asked, "What proportion of the present faculty do you consider to be seriously concerned, pro or con, with the formal institutional purposes that are intended to give direction and character to your college?" responses of the Southeast faculty compared with the CIT as follows:

	Southeast (%)	CIT (%)
Almost all	7	19
Well over half	0	26
About half	47	26
One-fourth or so	13	14
Very few	27	7
Such things are not the concern of the faculty	0	0
No response	7	6

The second question dealt with the attention given to educational philosophy and institutional objectives at the time of employment. This item and the responses from the Southeast faculty sample and the composite institutional total follow:

FQ1 When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the particular task for which you were being considered?

	Southeast	CIT
Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed, at greater length than the particulars of the job.	0	16
About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job description.	27	22
The institutional philosophy and educational purposes were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.	13	15
The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would relate thereto.	47	40
No response	13	7

These data show that the Southeast faculty sample remember a departmental and subject-matter emphasis in their negotiations for employment that slightly exceeds that of faculty respondents in the composite group. More evidence for departmental "autonomy" or, at least, the department as focal point of faculty attention--both points made by several Southeast administrators--appears in the lack of response in the first category.

Having stated that half or fewer of their colleagues were seriously concerned with "formal institutional purposes," and that the emphasis in recruitment was on departmental considerations, the Southeast faculty respondents than gave overwhelming support to the following Robert

FQ3 Hutchins' quotation: "The duty of the faculty is to formulate the purposes and programs of the University. The duty of the regents [trustees] is to interpret and defend them." Eighty-seven percent of Southeast respondents marked "I agree," while 7% (or one person) said "I disagree," and one did not answer. Four of fifteen faculty elected to use the "comments" section of this questionnaire item, with one stating a preference for having the faculty and trustees share responsibility for role formulation, and three enlarging, explaining or qualifying their earlier expression of agreement.

Many interpretations of the respondents' treatment of the preceding items are possible--with all possibilities qualified by the theoretical nature of the Hutchins' quote. Faculty might be stating an ideal, as compared to the "actualities" scale of reference in the other two questionnaire items. Some respondents might have meant, in answering that one-half or less of their colleagues were seriously interested in formal institutional purposes, not that the Southeast faculty is essentially indifferent to educational philosophy and institutional objectives but that, rather, the existing formal institutional purposes are not the sort to deserve the concern of faculty or do not give direction and character to the college. Nevertheless, we conclude that whatever the interpretations put on these data, the fact remains that this sample stated that at Southeast a minority of faculty were concerned for formal institutional purposes; that the emphasis in recruiting has been, so far as their experience has shown, on departmental considerations; and that, in their opinion, it was the duty of the faculty to give leadership in matters that were not then in their control. The contradiction, or confusion in values, is apparent.

FQ18 When the question was raised, "Who would you say has the most powerful voice in determining the educational policies, i.e., the general objectives rather than the particulars of a given program, in your college?", respondents favored two answers: the "chief administrative officer" and "an executive committee." Thirty-three percent gave the highest ranking to the former and 27% to the latter (meaning the Council for Administrative Policies), while the remainder of the responses were scattered. Once again, data confirm the view that faculty at Southeast operate largely in departmental contexts, while the chief administrators have responsibility for general institutional objectives. It is not so apparent that faculty think things should be this way or that they fully understand and accept the school's ideational commitments.

FQ16 There are five schools in the Institutional Character research project that have a church affiliation: North, Midwest, South, West, and Southeast. Respondents at Southeast ranked second among these five institutions in the percentage of participants marking the "Deeply religious" option of the question reading, "Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how would you describe yourself in the area of religion?" Twenty-seven percent so indicated, while 53% described themselves as "Moderately religious," 13% were "Largely indifferent to religion," and one person preferred not to answer. No one in the sample marked "Basically opposed to religion."

Searching further for indices of religious or ethical attitudes, the researchers turned to two items in one question that seemed germane to the point of how the faculty person might relate value questions to institutional objectives. The Southeast sample response and the composite institutional totals were as follows:

FQ14 Here are some prevalent opinions on the programs of American colleges and universities. Check the category that best indicates the applicability of each to your situation.

	Strongly agree		Agree		Can't say		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	Southeast	CIT	S.E.	CIT	S.E.	CIT	S.E.	CIT	S.E.	CIT
Not enough emphasis is placed on shaping the student's moral and ethical values.	20	8	13	18	53	20	13	36	0	10
Insufficient emphasis is being given to the validity of traditional norms for contemporary life.	13	6	0	16	73	30	7	33	7	9

The Southeast respondents seemed generally to feel that not enough emphasis was placed on shaping the student's moral and ethical values, while the CIT was somewhat in disagreement with this. With regard to the second item, Southeast did not voice as much disagreement as did the CIT with the idea that insufficient emphasis is being given to the validity of traditional norms for contemporary life. The results of both of these itmes are very clouded, however, because of the number of Southeast faculty respondents who chose the "Can't say" category. While respondents in all of the project colleges and universities had difficulty dealing with these value-judgment questions,at Southeast the "Can't say" figures were 53% and 73% respectively, the highest for any single institution. Why couldn't they speak to this matter? Could it be a comparative lack of perception in matters relating to broad institutional purposes and conditions at Southeast and elsewhere; or is it suggestive again of departmental, narrow-gauge, vision? Or should "Can't say" be read "Won't say," out of awareness and uneasiness that these matters ought to have been emphasized in such a college but weren't?

FQ2 "A sense of community" is usually included among the institutional objectives of American colleges and universities, and the achievement of it is usually considered a mark of institutional success. In the Southeast catalog (1966-67) nothing was said about "community" and the concept of community was not emphasized by respondents in administrative interviews. Responses from the faculty sample to a question in which "A sense of community" was included in a list of features of academic life that are usually important for faculty were divided as follows: 47% said that a sense of community was "Very important" to them, while 33% said "Somewhat important" and 20% regarded it as "Not important."

There is no great difference between the preceding figures and the CIT responses--36% "Very important," 50% "Somewhat important," and 12% "Not important--but a shift in emphasis appeared when the sample judged the importance of a sense of community for faculty colleagues:

View of Others (%)

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important		No response	
	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT
A sense of community	13	25	47	52	27	12	13	5

The attention of our sample to departmental considerations suggests that conventional criteria of institutional excellence may have been more important to them than an overarching philosophy of education, a sense of community, or an emphasis on innovations and experimentation. The faculty, like the administration, wanted to measure up to standards raised by the better colleges, as the data of the next table also suggest.

FQ2 The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution.

Personal View (%)

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important		No response	
	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT
Opportunity for professional advancement	87	55	13	38	0	6	0	1
Availability of research money and facilities	67	51	27	38	7	9	0	1
An enlightened, skillful administration	93	70	0	27	7	2	0	1
An emphasis on teaching	87	61	13	32	0	6	0	0
Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.	87	66	7	29	0	3	0	0
Opportunity to influence departmental policies	80	52	20	37	0	10	0	1
Geographical location	20	33	47	48	27	18	7	1

-continued-

View of Others (%)

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important		No response	
	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT
Opportunity for professional advancement	33	64	47	26	7	2	13	4
Availability of research money and facilities	27	51	53	34	7	6	13	4
An enlightened, skillful administration	33	48	40	38	7	4	20	5
An emphasis on teaching	33	32	53	48	0	12	13	4
Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.	33	45	40	41	13	4	13	5
Opportunity to influence departmental policies	47	42	20	44	20	5	13	5
Geographical location	13	21	53	59	7	9	27	6

On all the items in the Personal View section of this question, the Southeast response in the "Very important" category was more than 15% above the CIT, and compared with the other liberal arts colleges, Southeast response rates are higher in nearly every case.

A similar question in the faculty instrument asked respondents to rate the theoretical importance of the following themes:

FQ12

Personal View (%)

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important		No response	
	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT	Southeast	CIT
Teaching in the area of specialization	87	83	7	15	7	1	0	0
Student advising and counselling	73	44	20	41	7	14	0	1
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	60	26	33	55	7	17	0	1
Research and writing	60	66	27	27	13	5	0	1
			View of Others (%)					
Teaching in the area of specialization	73	72	7	17	0	2	20	6
Student advising and counselling	13	17	53	53	7	19	27	6
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	27	23	47	60	7	8	20	6
Research and writing	13	48	60	36	7	6	20	5

In all categories but research and writing, Southeast respondents were above the CIT in the proportion choosing the extreme category, "Very important" as their response. And, in comparison with the other independent liberal arts colleges, as before, Southeast faculty seemed to put heavier emphasis on these responsibilities and values which we have classified as belonging to the standard of conventional excellence.

In both of the preceding questionnaire items, however, faculty respondents at Southeast tended to see their colleagues as placing less importance than they themselves did on the individual subunits of the questions. This was true also of the CIT results, but not to such an extent. When a feature is rated by the CIT as "Very important" viewed personally, it is usually still regarded as being "Very important" for colleagues, even though the percent choosing this column is smaller. But at Southeast, respondents judge that those aspects of academic life which are "Very important" to them personally are just "Somewhat important" for their colleagues.

Southeast's percentage of "No response" answers is unusually high for the View of Others section. This pattern continues in the questions regarding innovation, making results difficult if not impossible to interpret.

FQ2 When asked about the importance of "an opportunity for experimentation and innovation" for them personally, faculty at Southeast replied with a high 80% saying "Very important" and 20% marking "Somewhat important." But when they were asked to extend this matter to faculty colleagues, 27% of the respondents said such an opportunity would be "Very important" for them while 60% thought colleagues might find it "Somewhat important." (On this part of the question 13% did not answer.) Thus, Southeast participants saw an opportunity for experimentation and innovation more important for themselves than was true for the composite institutional totals (where the figure for the Personal View, "Very important" column was 66%), but less important than the CIT for colleagues (CIT showed 35% for the same item).

Another statement in the questionnaire offered academic traditionalists an opportunity to stand up and be counted:

FQ15 Too much emphasis is presently being placed on innovation and experimentation in higher education. Existing standards and arrangements are sound, and these should be achieved and utilized--not replaced.

The composite totals for faculty went against the statement's claim, while the Southeast people split almost evenly when declaring their personal views on this matter:

Strongly agree		Agree		Can't say		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
S.E.	CIT	S.E.	CIT	S.E.	CIT	S.E.	CIT	S.E.	CIT
0	3	40	17	20	12	33	48	7	17

FQ19 When the Southeast sample was asked to scale colleagues on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of the college, 40% said that in their judgment "About half" were willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures, while 40% of the respondents said that "Some" were so disposed. No one, interestingly, checked the "Most" category, while 13% thought only a "Very few" would participate personally in experimentation. This compares with CIT as follows: 20% "Most," 23% "About half," 43% "Some," and 9% "Very few."

FQ19 On another part of the same item, one where respondents were asked to estimate the number of faculty "Not hostile to innovation but unwilling to get involved personally," 13% of the Southeast staff members thought that this statement would hold true for "Most" faculty there, while 27% said "About half," 47% responded with "Some," and 7% thought the statement to be true of "Very few." This calculation puts Southeast in the same general category with the other independent liberal arts colleges and, in fact, not far from the CIT totals: 18% "Most," 30% "About half," 35% "Some," and 11% "Very few."

FQ15 Interestingly, faculty respondents from Southeast agreed in considerable numbers with the questionnaire statement reading "Radical changes in our society necessitate radical changes in the educational experience offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different." Forty-seven percent of the individuals in the study said, "Strongly agree," while 27% said, "Agree." Only 7% disagreed and none chose to "Strongly disagree." Twenty percent elected the "Can't say" category. These totals put Southeast well above the CIT in accepting this declaration of a need for educational changes. But the preceding questionnaire item is, of course, conveniently abstract. When specific innovations were mentioned, Southeast respondents were less enthusiastic. Either they didn't like the stated innovations or, if interested, they allowed, like most of us, a gap between ideals and actualities. Even more frequent is the aforementioned result in which the individual declares himself interested in a certain innovation but cannot say as much for his colleagues.

FQ12 Cross-disciplinary teaching is widely regarded as an innovative arrangement in these days of tight specialization within academic departments. There were two items in the faculty questionnaire, neither rigorously defined, bearing on this change-option. In one instance when respondents were asked for their personal view about cross-disciplinary teaching, without regard to the actualities of their actual work load or experience, 80% of Southeast respondents said it was either "Somewhat important" or "Very important" to them. Thirteen percent thought it "Not important," and 7% gave no response. When thinking about their colleagues, however, respondents qualified the rather optimistic picture that emerged out of their self-perception. Colleagues, said 47% of the respondents, would find cross-disciplinary teaching "Very important" or "Somewhat important," while 27% thought peers would see it as "Not important." On this point 27% gave no response.

FQ2 Another item dealt with the same theme by asking about the importance for respondents of "Inter-disciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities." Speaking for themselves, 73% of the Southeast sample responded with "Very important" and an additional 27% said "Somewhat important." No participant answered otherwise. But the faculty View of Others was different. Thirteen percent gave no response, 27% thought such inter-disciplinary contacts and teaching opportunities would not be important, 47% thought these matters "Somewhat important" and 13% concluded that their peers would consider them "Very important."

The CIT provides a basis for comparison. The data on both items is given below:

FQ12,2

CIT (%)

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	No response
Personal View				
Cross-disciplinary teaching	27	45	25	2
Inter-disciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities	41	45	13	0
View of Others				
Cross-disciplinary teaching	10	46	33	6
Inter-disciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities	17	53	21	4

Southeast respondents go well above the CIT in Personal View but below it in View of Others. Again there is a larger differential between the personal view and view of others with Southeast College respondents than at any other institution in the sample.

When asked to judge the theoretical importance to them and to their colleagues of "Tutorials and other one-to-one student-faculty learning arrangements," the Southeast faculty members judged it as very important to them personally but only somewhat important to their colleagues. The results were as follows:

FQ12

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	No response
Southeast				
Self	53	40	7	0
Others	20	33	13	33
CIT				
Self	42	41	14	1
Others	15	53	18	8

The Southeast faculty was asked to respond with reference to their institution to the statement that "There should be less emphasis on grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements." Their responses compared with the CIT responses as follows (%):

FQ14

	Strongly agree	Agree	Can't say	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Southeast	13	40	20	20	7
CIT	21	42	6	24	4

The large proportion selecting the "Can't say" option and the lack of strong support for the item's proposition provides further confirmation that the Southeast sample was not as enamoured with the idea of innovation as their responses to earlier theoretical questions may have suggested.

One final area of inquiry that helped to reveal faculty attitudes at Southeast toward change, specifically toward educational innovations, were the questionnaire items dealing with various student characteristics. What did Southeast faculty respondents think about students?

FQ2 First, it is clear that they, like faculty everywhere, wanted well-motivated, hard-working students. Eighty-seven percent of the sample regard such students as "Very important" to the respondent personally, while 60% could say as much for their faculty peers. These results closely approximated those of the CIT.

Faculty at Southeast felt that students there could and should take a more active role academically than had been true up to the time of the study, and in this attitude the Southeast faculty appeared to be innovative when compared with faculties elsewhere. The question read: "Should students at your college participate more significantly than they do at present in the formulation and implementation of academic policies, i.e., in establishing the content and organization of courses, on academic policy committees, by student-formed and student-led seminars?" "Yes," replied 73%, while 13% said "No." (There was "No response" from two participants.) FQ4

This result is surprising when compared with the responses of faculty samples elsewhere on this question. In the CIT, only 34% said "Yes" and 62% said "No" ("No response," 4%). Obviously, the faculty member's perception of the local situation had some bearing. In places where students already had considerable participation, a negative response may have meant, "No more of a good thing." But at Southeast, where students had not been involved, these data must be regarded as manifestations of a liberalizing trend in the faculty or at least an inclination toward innovation in these matters.

It is not evident, however, that the Southeast faculty, insofar as our sample was candid about its thinking, would favor a corresponding liberalization of the social rules and formal behavioral restraints that regulated the personal lives of the students. They may have felt that a certain amount of supervision was needed to acculturate their upwardly mobile student body, for FQ15 when asked to give their personal response to this statement--"The concept of in loco parentis is unnecessary and undesirable because students should have the freedoms and responsibilities of adults"--the faculty data showed a divided and conservative attitude, one that is comparable to the CIT:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Can't say	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Southeast	13	33	33	13	0	7
CIT	15	38	11	25	3	2

The Southeast results on the two preceding questionnaire items were surprising to project staff. These data challenge the notion that a faculty conventionally oriented in academic matters would be more likely to favor the liberalization of social regulations than academic regulations, because they would be interested in protecting their control of academic and curricular matters but would be willing to see changes in the domain of the student personnel office. Southeast people tilted the other direction. Yet they seemed to be stoutly committed to conventional criteria of excellence, so it is not certain how far the faculty would support more student participation in policy formulation if those students challenged existing faculty assumptions. It may be that the Southeast respondents meant that the students should be "free" to choose that which heretofore the faculty have chosen for them.

Another source of information available to project researchers was the student questionnaire used in this multi-dimensional study. This instrument was administered to 291 entering freshmen at the beginning of the fall semester, 1966, when there were slightly over 1,000 full- and part-time students. From a total of seventy-four major items in the questionnaire, researchers drew out thirty-two that might suggest the student's perception of his school at the time of matriculation there.*

SQ46 When asked to indicate how much they knew, individually, about the "general philosophy of the college," 18% of the Southeast freshman class checked the column stating "Know a lot about it," while 68% checked "Know a little about it," and 6% checked "Don't know anything about it." Of ten different college units participating in the study, these data put Southeast eighth in the "Know a lot about it" category. The advantage that an observer might assign to a smaller and older college in conveying to counselors, student applicants, parents and others the philosophy or general objectives of the college is not sustained in this case. As a matter of fact, comparative data show that the new college has the advantage.

Keeping in mind that the Southeast student answered with very limited knowledge, or was exceedingly modest about what he knew, we turn to other items in the student questionnaire. One read:

SQ44
> Do you see this college as having some special quality that distinguishes it from other colleges and universities?

At Southeast, entering students divided their answers as follows: 74% thought that their school was "Not greatly different from other colleges," while 21%

---

*A small sample from this class is being studied longitudinally by other researchers at the Center and their reports will be published separately.

felt that it "Has a special distinguishing quality." This result is instructive in that the percentage of freshmen thinking that their college is "Not greatly different" was the highest of any participating institution.

We have claimed that the data depict Southeast as a college where the institutional objectives are mainly those that will bring success as measured by conventional criteria of excellence. But is there good congruence between what the college wants to provide or accomplish and the goals and interests sought by entering students? One section of the student questionnaire dealt with factors that influenced the student in his choice of the college he was attending. Respondents were to mark "Important," "Somewhat important," or "Not important or not applicable." The proportion of Southeast freshmen
SQ45 marking as important "Career reasons; that is, important for getting a good job, getting into graduate or professional school," was the highest in the institutional sample (68%). The orientation of the Southeast students in this direction, and it is certainly an understandable focus for them, was confirmed
SQ2 by their treatment of another question asking, "Which of the following objectives do you hope to gain in college?" Their "Most important" objective, among five options, was "To master certain techniques applicable to my vocation or field of interest" (57%). This proportion was also the highest on this question for the schools of this study. The second most important objective (18%) was, "To acquire and use the skills and habits involved in critical and constructive thinking."

It is this second objective that most closely resembles the educational goals favored by the Southeast faculty. Forty percent of the latter favored
FQ11 an option reading "Development of the ability of the person to think and to understand the consequences of his actions," while "Preparation for vocation

or profession" ranked second with a 27% response.

SQ45 The consideration next most important to career reasons in the student's selection of Southeast as the school of his choice was a "Closely-knit college community" with a "chance to know students and professors." Forty-three percent of the entering freshmen marked this as "Important." As mentioned earlier, neither the literature of the college nor the administrative interviews gave researchers the impression that a spirit of community was an especially important matter. Neither did the faculty questionnaire items dealing with this theme suggest that "community" was a special concern of the respondents.

Slightly more than a fourth (26%) of the Southeast student respondents stated in the questionnaire item dealing with factors influencing their
SQ45 selection of this college that an "Important" consideration was an "opportunity to participate in experimental educational programs." This percentage, while not high, was sufficient to put Southeast fourth among project schools on this point. This general interest in experimentation on the part of a goodly percentage of new students is shown in more specific ways and with larger supporting percentages in another part of the student questionnaire where the student was invited to speculate about the components that he would regard as important in an "ideal college." Notice the attitude of the Southeast freshmen on certain line items that bear on the theme of innovation:

SQ47 If you were to choose an ideal college, which of the following features would you prefer to have? If neither of the paired choices is exactly what you would like, check the one that comes nearest. (Southeast responses given in percent.)

-Mostly lecture classes	14	-Mostly group discussion classes	75
-Much emphasis on independent study	82	-Little emphasis on independent study	7
-Closely-knit college community	79	-Relatively impersonal college community	10
-Emphasis on broad, general program of learning	65	-Emphasis on a specialized area of learning	25

All of the above results, for the preceding item and earlier ones, suggest that the entering students at Southeast favored values that would call for changes in existant college arrangements or, at least, in the patterns that apparently prevailed at Southeast during the study.

Other elements of the preceding questionnaire item show that Southeast freshmen at entrance inclined at times toward orthodoxy and tradition. Consider their responses to the following:

-College traditional in most respects	60	-College experimental in most respects	28
-Courses graded "pass" or "fail"	10	-Courses given letter grades (A,B,C,D,F)	80

This decisive preference for letter grades, which was the highest percentage on this item for the total project sample, was supported by the results of another question directed to students:

SQ30 How do you feel about competing with other students for grades and recognition? (Responses in percent.)

10	I very much dislike it and prefer to avoid it.
14	I dislike it somewhat.
23	I have neutral feelings about this.
34	I like it somewhat.
17	I like it very much.

The total of 51%, when the last two categories are combined, made the Southeast freshmen first in the total sample on this item. Southeast freshmen at entrance, these data suggest, liked the conventional forms of academic competition.

Conclusion

The conclusion project staff have drawn from student and faculty data at Southeast is that the school at the time of the study was in such a period of uncertainty concerning yet unspecified changes that neither students nor faculty could understand more than a small segment of the situation in which they found themselves.

Students from essentially conservative homes were vaguely aware of social and academic changes with which they rather wanted to become identified, and yet their values were still conventional. Their responses on the questionnaire items reveal the tension implicit in that situation. Faculty were even more divided, contradicting their own statements and disagreeing with each other. They were personally uncertain about the emphases the new administration was bringing to the college and the way they would relate to whatever it was, and they had become sufficiently divided into subject-matter enclaves, or into young-old, liberal-conservative categories, that they were unable to accurately assess the institution's philosophy of education or the values and goals of their colleagues. Hence the large "Don't know" response blocs and the extreme gap between self-perception and View of Others.

However, by the end of the project's association with the college, the new administration was asserting itself, a sense of direction seemed evident, and both students and faculty were showing a concern for purpose as well as program that was to the project staff a harbinger of institutional vitality and relevance for the future.

CHAPTER IV

NORTH COLLEGE

College administrators are sometimes heard to say, "We have only one problem--money." The weakest colleges and universities aspire to enough money to buy an image approximating the schools within their vision, those which serve as their models; the more secure colleges think of their own financial condition relative to institutions that set the pace for them, and so on up the line. Even the best needs much more in order to remain best. The taste for money is insatiable.

The effect of money on institutional character was one reason for our interest in North College. We did not suppose that the generosity of the institution's principal benefactor in recent years had solved the school's problems. The gentleman's support for the general operating budget (about $1,000,000 annually) had to be more than equalled by money from other sources. Expanding opportunities for the college meant new programs and, hence, expanded obligations. Nevertheless, when the study was being organized, rumor had it that North College had been transformed within less than a decade and that a significant factor in this transformation was the money of one benefactor.

We were curious, less about what these new resources had made possible than about the priorities for what was being done and how they were determined. It seemed likely that major new financial resources would open change options to this college, and we wanted to know whether the school's leadership would confirm this and, if so, what alternatives were being explored. What role did faculty and students play in such an exploration and what means were employed to extend the range of inquiry?

We also were interested in having North participate in the study because of the presence there of certain capable administrative leaders who confronted, on the one hand, an increasingly professional and liberal faculty and, on the other, a rather more locally oriented constituency and, it seemed, a conservative funding agent. Innovations are always explicit or implied criticisms of the status quo and we wanted to follow developments in a college where it seemed that money was available from sources that might be opposed to significant changes, particularly any that would alter traditional institutional values. Had North seized the opportunity for innovation, if it existed, or were the new resources lavished on established programs and traditional objectives? Had the level of expectation changed, and, if so, in what direction? When a school's administrators can no longer say, "If we only had the money," do they act as they said they would if the money were available--or do something else? What? Why? It has been said that the issue for most church-related liberal arts colleges is not survival but significance (Patillo, 1965). That statement seemed especially relevant for this college. Our concern was to find out how administrators, faculty, and students at North defined significance, or, in our rubric, institutional character, and what they were doing to achieve it.

In the fall of 1966, the research project coordinator visited the college three times, where he interviewed eight administrators and six faculty members. One faculty member was interviewed a second time at another location. There were also two informal conversations with groups of students. The college's brochures were examined to give further impressions of the institution's goals. Questionnaires for faculty and students designed for this study were used for gathering data in a more formal manner. Thirty-five questionnaires were returned from the faculty sample, which gave us representation from 29% of the faculty. Only the entering freshman class was polled, and they returned 485 questionnaires. This represented 26% of all North students. Project personnel also had access to data on the students from the Omnibus Personality Inventory and from Robert Pace's College and University Environmental Scales. Our procedure in working with the three interest groups was to try to elicit through questionnaire or conversation perceptions of the institution, particularly with regard to its distinctiveness.

Institutional Self-Perception

North College publications--catalog (1966-67), brochures, and various reports state the institutional purposes:

> /North/ College is a Christian liberal arts college that endeavors to unite excellence in academic achievement with dedication in service.
>
> Believing that worthwhile life and a free society hinge upon enlightened intelligence, the College takes its primary task to be the sharing of great ideas among growing minds.
>
> Taking good will rooted in faith to be basic, the College seeks to constitute a community exemplifying the spirit of brotherhood. Christian in spirit, and...background, but not sectarian in outlook..../North/ seeks to cultivate in all its students constructive citizenship and aspires to bring out in many fearless zeal for justice, freedom and human well-being.
>
> The business of /North/ is that of changing students.... to help the student develop his greatest potential so that he may become an effective agent in helping to guide and mold forces at work in the world, rather than being merely affected and 'driven' by them.

The views expressed on these and related themes in the college catalog seem more explicitly stated than are similar expressions in the literature of any other school in the study. But behind the broad generalizations of such statements of purpose at North is the distinctiveness of financial stability, and perhaps a certain pride in that fact. The catalog reports both the "book" value of the school's endowment and its "market" value. The value of the campus and buildings is also reported. Endowed scholarships as of February 28, 1966, listed separately in the catalog, totaled 221. In every case a fund's principal is shown and in the vast majority of cases the benefactor and the person in whose name the award is established are also given. This list fills fifteen pages in the college catalog. Twenty-one loan funds are listed, as are six "special annually contributed scholarships." The total number of awards ends with a section listing thirteen "prizes."

It was not clear from admissions staff interviews just what sort of directives had come to that group from top college administrators on general institutional objectives. There was a major change in personnel in the admissions office during 1960-61, at about the time the "new North" drive began with its consequent vigorous recruiting program, but the goals of the college were presumed to be known, as far as we can tell, by all concerned.

The type of student sought by North was the well-motivated, bright, self-disciplined youth who embodied the values that have come to be associated with the American middle class. From administrative interviews we received the impression that the interest of some admissions counsellors in more dissident students was not supported by the committee on admissions and, therefore, noncomformists, trouble-makers and boat-rockers tended to be rejected. Observation and interviews gave the impression that students were orderly, well-scrubbed, and essentially conservative, with theoretical interest in controversial issues--black power, civil rights, political radicalism, and the views of the developing "adversary subculture"--but that very few of them were personally active.

Of the freshmen enrolled in 1966, 82% were in the top fifth of their high school graduating class. The college ranks high in the number of National Merit Scholars in its student body. The emphasis of the school's literature on these matters, confirmed by one administrator, supports the conclusion that at the time of the study student applications were judged mainly by SAT verbal and math scores (with special emphasis on the former), rank in class, high school student body offices held, extracurricular interests, athletic accomplishments, and, in some cases, other nonintellective variables.

If the picture of financial solidarity and student stolidity are indices of the operation of conventional criteria of excellence at this college, so is the profile of the faculty. A local newspaper reported that the executive vice president and provost had released figures showing that 67% of the faculty held Ph.D. degrees in the year of our study, compared to 30% five years earlier. And this faculty, particularly the newer contingent, have impressive credentials--Fulbrights, Woodrow Wilsons, Danforths, and other awards--with the advanced degrees coming from prestigious schools.

Origin of academic degree, number of publications, previous teaching positions, success in teaching, and evaluation of peers were the main criteria for faculty appointments. At North, however, unlike many places where standard professional criteria are employed but teaching is treated lightly, there were indications that teaching was still important. In the previously mentioned newspaper clipping describing the number of Ph.D.'s, one of the chief administrators made it clear that the college was not going to forsake its traditional commitment to teaching in a preference for faculty research and writing. But a "balanced emphasis," we were told, had helped to lift North into the circle of top church-related colleges, and administrators were confident that the balance between teaching and research could be maintained.

No division between "young Turks" and "old guard" in faculty was acknowledged in administrative interviews, and an emphasis on the creation of an academic community was evident throughout these conversations. One person cited the practice of the provost in making himself available for discussion with the faculty about once a month on any matters of concern to the community. About a third of the faculty members, it was said, take this opportunity to exchange ideas, criticisms, and evaluations.

The faculty has become more insistent in recent years on participation in policy decisions directly affecting faculty welfare. Its personnel committee reviews such matters as faculty salaries and raises with the administration but does not yet share in the allocation of the annual budget. This decision remains with the budget committee of the board of trustees. But the budget is published each year, and the faculty is becoming more interested in budget allocations. There have been changes in the extent to which faculty members are involved in these considerations, and certain administrators allowed that there probably would be others in the future. The board of trustees is very active in the life of the college--including in its organization an education committee, student life committee, investment committee, and others. The faculty is increasingly active in these same matters. It is not evident, however, whether the faculty wants power in order to change the shape and direction of the college or to control the status quo and secure its place in it. The question, then, is to what use incipient organizational innovation will be put?

In many ways this is an innovative college. The international emphasis at North takes the form of a large number of imaginative programs: SPAN, or the Student Project for Amity among Nations, which enables students to travel to foreign countries during the summer on individual study projects; the Mexican Caravan; the Canadian-American Conference; World Press Institute, bringing foreign journalists to the U.S. and to the college; and SWAP, or the Student Work Abroad Project. The 4-1-4 academic calendar makes possible, among other things, an interim term opportunity for intensive study of European national cultures, art, economic problems and languages.

There has been a definite effort at North, as a part of its international program, to bring foreign students into the college community. When it was found that these students did not stay as long as had been hoped and were not successfully integrated into the life of the institution, North revised its program to make it worthwhile for the foreign students to come if only for a short stay of one or two years.

During 1966-67, special projects funded by the one benefactor numbered 47. Some had yet to be launched, several that were in operation were floundering, others were regarded as very successful. The visiting scholar program, whereby several influential European scholars had been brought to the campus, was occasionally mentioned as a successful venture that would be continued.

One of the proposed programs would free twenty-three to twenty-five faculty per year, from a total of 122 faculty, for research on campus during the academic year during the next five years. These faculty members would teach two courses each term and have the rest of their time free for research and writing. This is an interesting way to accommodate the needs of the new research-minded faculty without taking up the alterantive of an across-the-board reduction in the faculty teaching load. Under this plan, release time would be given selectively and without sacrificing the school's commitment to teaching.

The curriculum, too, has undergone some changes. An area studies program that has been worked out with three other nearby Christian liberal arts colleges brings students and faculty together in integrated study at the upper division level. In one of North's publications, this was called "a unique contribution to American undergraduate education." Also, North offers an alternative to the conventional major by making provision for the student to substitute a "core concentration." The "core" consists of two sets of six courses, one set within a department and one outside, to be approved by the department(s) concerned.

Most of the student's academic program, however, is organized and judged conventionally. Departments are strong and carry the expected range of courses. A residence requirement, the letter-grade formula (though there is a pass-fail option), midterm and final examinations, and other standard arrangements predominate. The visitor gets the impression that the college prefers to change like the automobile industry--by extending the line of products and services, improving quality and innovating within the predicted taste range of the trade.

An example of the North way with innovation is revealed, we think, in the organizational provisions the college has worked out for the participation of students in governance. In 1966-67, academic administration was in the hands of the faculty, with considerable power delegated to a faculty advisory committee (six elected faculty members). The faculty had also set up an academic affairs council (later to be disbanded), with two committees advising and reporting to it--the in-class advisory council and the out-of-class advisory council. Students sat on both of these committees, with the academic dean heading the in-class and the dean of students the out-of-class.

From North's perspective, this rather elaborate arrangement was seen, no doubt, as evidence that the college was innovative at the point of student participation in policy formulation. The arrangement provided an educational experience for student representatives and gave them a role in academic and social deliberations. From another and critical perspective, however, the academic affairs committee appeared to serve as a buffer between faculty and students, with the powerful faculty advisory committee and the faculty senate effectively insulated by this device from student influence. The students had only a tertiary role, safely removed from real power. By introducing students to academic policy formulation the college had gone beyond what was being done in most institutions of higher education. However, North had innovated safely. The college was doing enough to satisfy its desire to be innovative without doing so much as to jeopardize its commitment to conventional excellence.

To the outside observer, the innovations of the college, including the varied and numerous programs with an international flavor, are all variations on familiar themes. And nothing suggests that anything else is desired by faculty. Nor, indeed, on the basis of surface manifestations does anything different seem to be desired by the majority of the students. They are hard-working, professionally oriented youth whose values are middle class. They could hardly be expected to initiate radical innovations in education.

On the administrative level two surprises emerge that may be the most radically different features of North College. They illustrate how a college, like a corporation, particularly if the business ethic governs its operation, may react innovatively to external opportunities or to an internal problem. When it appeared that the then academic dean of the college might be hired away to become president of another liberal arts college, North responded with an innovation. The dean was a highly respected academic leader, finding favor with all segments of the college community. Therefore, under pressure from the board of trustees and from the faculty, the president of the college created the position of executive vice president and provost and put the dean in that chair. Thus, the president had one vice president for financial affairs and another for academic matters, the executive vice president serving the latter function. The innovative feature that carries this arrangement beyond general practice in American higher education is that the former dean was authorized to report on academic life directly to the board of trustees through its education committee. The president called this plan an innovation, and noted that senior officers in corporations today often share policy-making responsibilities. However, it was stated that this responsibility had been designated for the one person only and was not transferable to his successor. This feature made the plan innovative not only in higher education but for corporate management, too.

Another innovation, responding to an external opportunity, has to do with the way policy decisions have been made concerning the specific allocation of money from the school's principal benefactor. This gentleman and his wife had given $30,000,000 to the college by the end of the 1966-67 academic year including $4,250,000 for a fine arts center in honor of his mother, and, in addition, was pledged to match up to $10,000,000 over a period not to exceed 10 years (beginning in 1963-64). The college had to raise a minimum of $750,000 each year. His working contacts, however, have been confined to the president and the executive vice president and provost, with the benefactor's representative playing an increasingly important intermediary role. This arrangement has limited the number of persons involved in the transactions through which so much of the life of the college was and will be affected (particularly if the college receives, as is rumored, an additional $25,000,000). Ideas flowed from the president and/or the executive vice president and provost to the benefactor (as in the case of the package of proposals transmitted at the time of our study), were approved by him, and then presented to the faculty or the appropriate segment of the college community. Through his emissary, the benefactor would convey his decision on which of the proposals he would fund. Because his views on the nature of the college and the characteristics of its program have been entirely conventional, as are those of his emissary, college officials have been in the difficult position of trying to write proposals that would satisfy these values and, at the same time, shape proposals appropriate to the future of the college and the values of its faculty.

The executive vice president and provost said that several times he would have consulted faculty committees on new program ideas had there been time and if he could have been sure that they would facilitate things and not turn obstructionist. The sensitivity of the situation was not caused primarily by the benefactor's attitude--he has been called the "perfect angel"--because, while he has standards and will not support programs that conflict with them, he has never threatened to withdraw his support from the college because of the existence there of variant standards or programs which he did not favor. However, the college to the time of this research project had not ventured far from the benefactor's values, partly because of an essential compatibility in these matters and partly because of the feeling in the administration that the long-range benefits of this money to the college will more than compensate

m

for immediate and partial compromises. Therefore, in view of all these complexities, we conclude that one of the most innovative aspects in the life of North College has been the way the administration, the executive vice president and provost particularly, has worked to reconcile the interests and preferences of a conservative benefactor and board on the one hand and a more liberal faculty on the other--a faculty which while not radical in social and political values is sensitive about its academic autonomy. It has taken consummate skill to persuade faculty to accept programs that they did not plan.

Study of North's literature and insights gained through administrative interviews gave project researchers the impression that eighty-three year old North has been attempting for the last seven or eight years to do what South College, founded in 1960, has attempted during the same period. These denominational schools have experienced growth in numbers and quality, have been concerned to secure a teaching faculty with guild qualifications and scholarly interests, have offered variations of a core program and putative emphasis on international studies, have drawn cheerful, hard-working students, and have had strong-willed, energetic administrative leadership.

The preceding comparison is, of course, an oversimplification. North has more money, better facilities, a stronger board, a more highly developed international program, and more award-winning students and nationally viable faculty members. South has a stronger religious orientation, a more comprehensive core program, a greater interest in experimentation and, at the time of the project, a more aggressive, less democratic leadership. These gradations of difference are just what one might expect when comparing an older with a newer institution. What is surprising is that the newer school has closed the gap to the point that such comparisons can be made at all.

Faculty and Student Perspectives

We turn now to faculty and student perspectives on the same themes that provided the lines for the institutional portrait we have already sketched. Through the faculty questionnaire and the student questionnaire, plus other miscellaneous data, we hoped to discover how these important interest groups viewed the matters we have defined as indices of institutional distinctiveness and to reveal any gaps that might exist between official statements about the college and how it was viewed by faculty and students.

Two items in the faculty questionnaire (FQ) asked respondents to estimate the attitudes of colleagues toward institutional objectives and the traditions of the institution. North faculty responses compared with the composite institutional total (CIT) were as follows:

FQ5 What proportion of the present faculty do you consider to be seriously concerned, pro or con, with the formal institutional purposes that are intended to give direction and character to your college?

	North (%)	CIT (%)
Almost all	11	19
Well over half	37	26
Almost half	43	26
One-fourth or so	6	14
Very few	0	7
Such things are not the concern of the faculty	0	0
No response	3	6

(Notice that 91% of North's faculty utilized the first three response categories)

FQ9 Do your colleagues express much loyalty for the history and traditions of this institution?

	North (%)	CIT (%)
About as much as faculties in similar institutions elsewhere	74	46
More than in similar institutions elsewhere	11	23
Less than in similar institutions elsewhere	9	21
No response	6	9

North faculty, it seems, wanted to represent their peers as rather more concerned, generally, for broad educational issues than is true of faculties elsewhere, while avoiding extreme enthusiasm. This impression is supported by comparing the data with the composite institutional totals. On the matter of history and traditions, however, faculty respondents overwhelmingly represented their colleagues as being like faculties elsewhere. The question that emerges from these data is whether a college of North's purposes and traditions will be satisfied with the faculty representation of these aspects of its character. The college community might hope for a more vital identification by the faculty with the school's traditions.

Another questionnaire item deals with the individual's own involvement in or concern for broad institutional objectives.

FQ1 When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the particular task for which you were being considered?

	North (%)	CIT (%)
Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed, at greater length than the particulars of the job.	14	16

-continued-

	North (%)	CIT (%)
About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job description.	29	22
The institutional philosophy and educational purposes were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.	23	15
The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would relate thereto.	20	40
No response	9	7

If the first two categories may be taken as indicative of active attention to educational philosophy and the second two categories as implying an emphasis on departments, then this faculty sample divides evenly, 43% for each cluster. CIT results yield 38% as the combined total on the first two options and 55% for the second grouping. North faculty, thus, apparently give more attention to educational philosophy and institutional purposes than the composite total, but perhaps it should be added that this college is third on this item among the project's four private liberal arts colleges.

Marked congruence is apparent between the school's stated goals as found in the catalog and the views of the faculty sample as shown in their responses FQ11 to this question:

> Which of the following goals of higher education come closest to your own view of what education should do?

The order of preference shown by the sample was almost identical to the CIT, as well as being consonant with the emphases of the school's catalog. Following are the results:

	North(%)			CIT(%)		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Preparation for vocation or profession	3	20	20	8	15	24
Provision of knowledge, facts, and information	14	9	17	7	15	18
Development of the ability of the person to think and to understand the consequences of his actions	63	11	3	63	11	6
Education for character	0	6	9	2	4	8
Development of individual capacity for good judgment	6	31	14	10	30	12
Training for citizenship	0	0	3	0	2	6
No response	7	23	31	4	21	24

These six response options can be "collapsed" to three categories of concern. The first two, "Preparation for vocation or profession" and "Provision of knowledge, facts, and information," may be considered as the concern of faculty who may be termed essentialists--those who believe there is a well-defined body of knowledge to be taught and that it is to be learned for essentially utilitarian reasons. Options three and five, "Development of the ability of the person to think and to understand the consequences of his actions" and "Development of individual capacity for good judgment," may be seen as emphasizing concerns of faculty existentialists--how the individual takes the learning and what it does for him. The remaining items, "Education for character" and "Training for citizenship," suggest to us traditional societal concerns for the person in and as a part of a social institution.

If these three categories are allowed to stand, at least as a basis for speculation, perhaps the most interesting data to be drawn from the item are those which show what respondents chose to ignore or minimize. At North no one marked the character or citizenship categories as first choice for the goal of higher education, and the record of the CIT was not very different. In the CIT, of a total of 577 respondents, only eleven persons marked "Education for character" as first choice, and only two persons selected as first goal "Training for citizenship." Nor were these options selected in any considerable numbers as second or third preferences at this college or in the CIT.

Preferences among faculty samples at all participant institutions ran heavily to what we have typed as the existentialist concerns, with the essentialist concerns running well behind. Yet, the same faculties who are existentialists in setting educational goals appear to be essentialists in educational forms and structures. They want individual values to result from collectivized methods.

We turn now to the matter of faculty perspectives on conventional standards of academic excellence. How does faculty thinking on these matters square with institutional ideas revealed in the literature and through administrative interviews? Two questions in the faculty questionnaire were structured to allow respondents to indicate their own preferences regarding such standards and to judge the thinking of their colleagues concerning the same matters. The two questions were:

FQ2

> The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution.

Personal View (%)

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	North	CIT	North	CIT	North	CIT
Opportunity for professional advancement	40	55	49	38	9	6
Availability of research money and facilities	46	51	43	38	9	9
An emphasis on teaching	63	61	34	32	0	6
Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.	49	66	40	29	6	3
Opportunity to influence departmental policies	49	52	37	37	9	10

View of Others (%)

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	North	CIT	North	CIT	North	CIT
Opportunity for professional advancement	69	64	26	26	0	2
Availability of research money and facilities	31	51	57	34	6	6
An emphasis on teaching	57	32	37	48	0	12
Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.	40	45	51	41	3	4
Opportunity to influence departmental policies	40	42	51	44	3	4

Q12 Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.

Personal View (%)

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	North	CIT	North	CIT	North	CIT
Teaching in the area of academic specialization	77	83	20	15	0	1
Student advising and counselling	51	44	40	41	6	14
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	34	26	51	55	9	17
Research and writing	49	65	43	27	3	5

View of Others (%)

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	North	CIT	North	CIT	North	CIT
Teaching in the area of academic specialization	83	72	11	17	3	2
Student advising and counselling	20	17	66	53	11	19
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	14	23	71	60	11	8
Research and writing	17	48	63	36	14	6

Data from these two questions ~~indicate that the faculty~~ at North is essentially in agreement with the balance between teaching and research that the administration has established. Compared to the CIT, they emphasize the importance of teaching, show interest in students, and play down several aspects of the modern academic's professional life.

But it may be argued that a comparison with the CIT is not relevant for this college because the CIT is skewed by the comparatively large N's fed into the total from schools with quite different emphases. North could better be compared with the independent liberal arts colleges of the study. But, indeed, the faculty respondents match up very well with their counterparts at this level. There is no important difference among these schools in their responses to the last two questions.

Our justification for the claim that North is attracting an increasingly professionally-oriented faculty is taken from the "View of Others" column on these two questions. Social conditioning may cause one to give the ideal response, or what one would do if only moral considerations were in question. But such idealizations are not necessarily a guide to practical behavior. Because the behavior of others is more observable than their thoughts, what the respondent sees in them may give more guidance on the practical realities of the situation. Thus, having noticed the sizable differences between the respondent's self-judgment and his view of others, and making some allowance for the possibility of distortion in both directions, we have assigned considerable importance, in arriving at our conclusions on academic values, to faculty perspectives of professional colleagues. So judged, the North faculty seems to be strongly in favor of teaching in the area of specialization, working as student academic counselors, and seizing opportunities for professiona advancement. This thesis is challenged, it is true, by the research and writing category, where respondents reported that these professional activities were comparatively unimportant for their peers compared with themselves and the CIT. But, by and large, we are impressed by the measure of agreement between conventional standards of excellence and the characteristics of the professional life of faculty at this institution.

Further indication of the faculty's increasing professionalism was found in their responses to two questionnaire items relating to the role that the FQ18 faculty plays in leadership at the college. One read, "Who would you say has the most powerful voice in determining the educational policies, i.e., the general objectives rather than the particulars of a given program, in your college?" Respondents were invited to select from a list of options and to rank their answers as first most powerful, next most powerful, and third most powerful. The following list shows the first choices of North faculty compared to the first choices of the CIT:

	North (%)	CIT (%)
Trustees or regents	14	5
Chief administrative officer for your campus	9	20
Chief administrative officer of your program (Dean, Provost)	49	18
Division head	0	1
An executive committee	6	6
The general faculty	11	33
Students	0	0
Constituency	0	1
Statewide coordinating agency	0	1
Others	0	2
No response	11	12

The significance of the executive vice president and provost in setting general objectives, in the opinion of our sample, is dramatized when the response for the appropriate category at North--49%--is compared to that of the CIT--18%.

An interesting speculation on "what ought to be" as opposed to "what is" in the thinking of faculty is provided by faculty responses to a provocative FQ3 quotation by Robert Hutchins: "The duty of the faculty is to formulate the purposes and programs of the university. The duty of the regents [trustees] is to interpret and defend them." North faculty were close to the CIT on this item, yet more inclined to conventional practice:

	North (%)	CIT (%)
I agree	71	80
I disagree	26	16
No response	3	3

A comparison of the faculty's treatment of this item with the one listed previously shows that the same faculty which represents itself as the body that should be responsible for setting institutional objectives sees leadership in these matters actually coming from certain administrators.

North's traditional association with a Protestant denomination, and the college catalog's description of North as a "Christian liberal arts college," prompts us to draw on that item in the faculty questionnaire dealing with attitudes toward religion as another way of identifying functional and dysfunctional aspects in the relationship between the formal purposes of the institution and its several interest groups. Respondents were given five response options, plus ample space for "Comments." The question read:

FQ16 Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how would you describe yourself in the area of religion?

	North (%)	CIT (%)
Deeply religious	6	14
Moderately religious	54	33
Largely indifferent to religion	20	28
Basically opposed to religion	0	11
Prefer not to answer	6	4
No response	6	7
Variant responses	9	2

When the above figures are viewed from the perspective of the history and tradition of the college in which these respondents work, the impression is conveyed that the number of faculty considering themselves "Deeply religious" is surprisingly small. People at North do not oppose organized religion nor are they indifferent to religions values, but they are hardly enthusiasts. Comparing these figures to responses from other schools in the project, North shows the smallest percentage of "Deeply religious" faculty among church-related institutions and, indeed, it is well down the list compared to secular institutions on this line-item. The 54% marking "Moderately religious" is, on the other hand, the highest figure among all participating schools for this response option. Respondents are clustered in the two categories--"Moderately religious" and "Largely indifferent to religion"--with the result that while secular institutions in the study show a much wider range of opinion regarding religion their percentages in these two categories approximate those of North.

14 North faculty in our sample reject the notion that "Not enough emphasis is placed on shaping the student's moral and ethical values." The responses to the above statement follow: Strongly agree, 0%; agree, 17%; can't say 20%; disagree, 46%; strongly disagree, 11%; no response, 3%; variant response, 3%. The faculty, generally speaking, seem satisfied with the value dimensions of the school's programs.

Entering freshmen at North appear to be somewhat more religiously oriented than faculty, but the difference is less than we expected to find. The student questionnaire item corresponding to the religious item presented to the faculty read:

24 Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how do you think of yourself?

	North Freshmen (%)
I am deeply religious	15
I am moderately religious	63
I am largely indifferent to religion	16
I am basically opposed to religion	3
I have no opinion	2

A more probing question on religious and philosophical values followed, with student data shown:

26 Which of the following statements most closely describes your personal religious, philosophical or ethical convictions?

	North Freshmen (%)
I have strong religious beliefs and convictions to which I adhere without hesitation.	4
I have a well-organized philosophy of life which guides most of my thinking and behavior.	15

-continued-

	North Freshmen (%)
I have a general philosophy of life by which I try to live.	24
Although troubled at times by doubts, I have a set of personal beliefs which I can apply to most situations.	40
My personal beliefs are hazy, changing, and of uncertain importance in my life.	7
I deal with situations as they arise and my values are determined accordingly.	8
I do not think it necessary to have well-organized personal beliefs, and I prefer to avoid abstract speculations.	1
No response	1

It is apparent that the entering student believes that he has a fairly well-developed philosophy of life--83% of the sample selected one of the first four options in the question above, and 78% regard themselves as moderately to deeply religious. Therefore, the religious tradition of the institution is likely to present less difficulty for the new student than the prevailing moderate-to-indifferent religious stance of most faculty and, apparently, of the administration.

SQ46 When students were asked how much they knew about the general philosophy of the college when they enrolled, 24% answered "Know a lot about it," 70% replied "Know a little about it," and those who said "Don't know anything about it" comprised only 4%. These figures compare favorably with returns from the others of the older institutions in our study, but unfavorably with returns from the new and innovative campuses. Students answering "Know a lot about it" numbered over 60% at two of these new colleges.

SQ44 More entering freshmen at North in 1966 saw their college as having a special distinguishing quality than did such students on older campuses, but fewer than students on new campuses. Some 31% saw the college as "Not greatly different from other colleges," while 67% saw it as having "a special distinguishing quality." Not surprisingly, but perhaps significantly, in two innovative new colleges the student confidence in the existence of a special distinguishing quality in their college ran as high as 90% to 100%.

When North students were invited to specify the special quality they felt their college had, 34% of those responding listed academic features, such as the international programs or general academic reputation, while the second largest response offered by 20% mentioned the social character of the institution, that is, we surmise, the emphasis on community.

Another question in the student testing instrument was expected to reveal student values and the match of freshman expectations with the values of the college they were entering.

SQ45 How important was each of the following considerations to you in selecting the college you are now attending? Check one for each item.

	North Freshmen (%)		
	Important	Somewhat important	Not important or not applicable
Career reasons; that is, important for getting a good job, getting into graduate or professional school	42	40	16
Closely-knit college community, chance to know students and professors	65	26	7
Extra-curricular activities	24	49	25

-continued-

	North Freshmen (%)		
	Important	Somewhat important	Not important or not applicable
Financial reasons, such as having a scholarship	38	15	46
Friends attending this college	7	18	73
General academic reputation of the college	78	19	2
Geographic location, climate, etc.	36	39	22
Influence or wishes of parents	16	44	38
Opportunity for a great deal of freedom in my personal life	25	46	28
Opportunity to live away from home	32	28	38
Opportunity to participate in experimental educational programs	13	33	51
Opportunity to pursue an individualized academic program	47	34	17
Parent(s) attended the college	2	6	88
Variety of elective courses	27	47	23
A particular department	26	34	36

Notice that three of the four features most emphasized by entering freshmen at North as considerations most important to them in selecting the college--a closely-knit college community, general academic reputation, and career reasons--are themes much emphasized by administration and faculty.

A general impression emerging from study of student data involving all of the participating colleges and universities of the Institutional Character Study is that somehow--by the work of counselors, the accuracy of printed materials, the students' intuitive skills, the grace of God--there is remarkable congruence between the expectations of entering students and that which the institution they are going into is promising to provide. Perhaps students are identifying with the characteristics of their college. If so, it is encouraging to realize that students know so much about what they are getting into. It may be, on the other hand, that colleges and universities promise much the same thing and that early conditioning has made students docile or acquiescent.

An "opportunity to participate in experimental educational programs" was not a matter of prime importance for the majority of North students. SQ47 In their response to one item in a forced choice list of the characteristics they would include in their ideal college, 54% of the students chose a "college traditional in most respects" while a strong minority of 44% chose a "college experimental in most respects." In a college which claims to be innovative, the majority of entering freshmen seem to prefer conventional arrangements.

FQ15 The faculty profess to support the idea of innovation. When respondents were asked to give their view on whether "Radical technological changes in our society necessitate radical changes in the educational experience offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different," the results were as follows:

	North (%)
Strongly agree	20
Agree	37
Can't say	11
Disagree	20
Strongly disagree	6

However, since this score distribution roughly parallels that of the CIT, we conclude that this college which has claimed to be more innovative than others finds its faculty, as well as freshmen, lagging behind its institutional philosophy.

The faculty expressed the same general concern in their responses to a
5 somewhat more specific item which stated that "Too much emphasis is presently
being placed on innovation and experimentation in higher education. Existing
standards and arrangements are sound and should be achieved and utilized--not
replaced." Respondents sided with innovation, as the data show:

	North (%)	CIT (%)
Agree strongly	0	3
Agree	9	17
Can't say	11	12
Disagree	57	48
Strongly agree	17	17
No response	3	1

FQI

On this item, support for present emphases on innovation ran somewhat above the CIT.

When asked how important to the individual was "An opportunity for
2 experimentation and innovation," faculty results were as follows:

	North (%)	
	Self	View of Others
Very important	40	34
Somewhat important	49	54
Not important	9	6

The students, then, voice little support for innovation while the faculty are more favorably inclined to the idea. But when the faculty's general, diffuse interest in change and innovation is put to the test of specific proposals it seems to lose force rapidly. The converse is true of the students. Their support for specific changes that we would call innovative is strong in spite of their reluctance to conceptualize them as innovative.

The fourth theme emphasized by the students as important to them in selecting the college--individualized academic programs--is not considered to be of major importance by the faculty. When faculty respondents were asked to give their personal view and their impressions of the views of their peers as to the importance of "Tutorials and other one-to-one student-faculty learning arrangements," they replied as follows:

12

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
North (%)			
Self	31	51	14
Others	23	66	9
CIT (%)			
Self	42	41	14
Others	15	53	18

Freshmen at North include in their profile of an ideal college not only many of the features characteristic of this college but also some that transgress the commitment of the college to the standards of conventional institutional excellence. "Emphasis on a broad, general program of learning" was chosen by 82% of the student respondents while only 16% chose "emphasis on a specialized area of learning." The faculty did not place as much importance on such matters. This is revealed in two faculty questionnaire items, the first of which was the question of the importance the respondent placed on "Interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities." The results were:

FQ2

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
North (%)			
Self	31	51	14
Others	14	66	14
CIT (%)			
Self	41	45	13
Others	17	53	21

The second item asked faculty respondents to state the theoretical importance for them of "Cross-disciplinary teaching." Results made the respondents' specialist, departmental preferences rather clear:

FQ12

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
North (%)			
Self	20	43	34
Others	3	63	31
CIT (%)			
Self	27	45	25
Others	10	46	33

One further item on the student questionnaire indicated that the disagreement between faculty and students over whether or not they should pursue a "broad, general program of learning" might be important. The students were asked why they were inclined to favor a certain academic major:

SQ3 If you have a major, what were the main reasons for your choice of this major? (Check those that apply)

	North Freshmen (%)
Long-term interest	37
Made good grades in this subject during high school	23
It appeared to have the least over-all pressure (difficulty or amount of work; competition)	1

-continued-

	North Freshmen (%)
Parents' wish or advice	2
High school faculty encouraged me	8
Prestige of occupation toward which it leads	9
Leads to work with people	22
Freedom of course selection in that department	5
I had friends majoring in it who influenced me	2
Quality of faculty or their approach	6
Opportunity for significant accomplishment in the area	19

The relevant item in this list is "leads to work with people." It ranked third and was in a virtual tie for second. This response suggests a social service orientation, active or potential, that may not be easily encased in most departmental programs. Nor is it compatible with the theoretical, detached orientation of many faculty.

In other areas as well there appear to be differences in priorities evident between the students and the institution. The students favor a liberalized admissions policy; 57% want students to be selected mostly on personal qualities, while 40% prefer mostly grades and admission scores. They are almost evenly divided on the issue of competitiveness for grades. And while they side with conventional letter grades rather than pass-fail, the difference is not decisive--56% to 42%.

Q47

Q47

The faculty was also split on the issue of the importance of grades. The statement that "There should be less emphasis on grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements" met with the following responses:

FQ14

	North (%)	CIT (%)
Strongly agree	23	21
Agree	23	42
Can't say	6	6
Disagree	40	24
Strongly disagree	6	4
No response	3	1

The faculty at North, though split on this issue, was less in agreement with the statement than was the CIT.

Concerning student participation in academic affairs, we again found faculty and students in disagreement. At North, as we have seen, students were involved at the time of our study as full participants in the "in-class" subcommittee of the faculty committee on academic affairs. This arrangement was a fairly generous one, compared to those prevailing nationally. It provided a way for the voices of students to be heard by those who were at the centers of power. The faculty strongly rejected the notion of more student participation in academic policy formulation. Interestingly, this issue was one on which faculties across the country had definite and usually negative views. The North College response was, in fact, very close to the composite:

FQ4 Should students at your college participate more significantly than they do at present in the formulation and implementation of academic policies, i.e., in establishing the content and organization of courses, on academic policy committees, by student-formed and student-led seminars?

	North (%)	CIT (%)
Yes	34	34
No	63	62

This questionnaire item must be answered from the context of existing conditions in a particular institution, not against some abstract or absolute standard.

The freshman sample at North showed strong support, at least theoretically, for the notion that there should be student participation in the formulation of academic policies. The following item reveals this point:

SQ57 Should students participate significantly in the content and organization of courses, academic policy decisions and matters of this sort?

	North (%)
Yes	52
No	7
Maybe	35
Don't know	7
No response	0

A related question, but one that broadens the issue considerably, presented student respondents with two alternatives:

SQ58 Which of these statements comes closer to your own view?

> Students should be given very great freedom in choosing their subjects of study and in choosing their own areas of interest within those subjects.
>
> There is a body of knowledge to be learned, and the faculty is more competent than the student to direct the student's course of study, through required courses, prerequisites, and the like.

At North, 62% of the entering class sample sided with the "freedom" statement, while 37% favored the more structured relationship. This result supports data mentioned earlier in which the students showed a preference for independent study and group discussions.

Conclusion

Despite the good match at North between student desires and general institutional promises, there is a gap between what the students would like and what they are likely to get from the faculty. Our data show that if there is a basis of support for innovation at North it is more likely to be among the students than the faculty.

The educational philosophy and the broad institutional objectives of North College have not been matters of principal concern to the academic community as a whole during the recent years of transformation. We see no evidence that administrators, faculty, and students have carried on a dialogue about institutional goals. Everyone assumed that everyone knew what the goals were but, at a time of considerable change in the size and perhaps in the character of the faculty, and certainly at a time of change in the intellectual and social disposition of the student body, this assumption was shaky at best. The nature of the institution supposedly known to all was, according to administrators, that North would remain a Christian liberal arts college and that it was becoming an innovative one. But, North seems to us to be no more or less Christian than hundreds of other colleges whose Christianity is largely residual, nor do we see the basis for their faith that they are becoming particularly innovative. The money the college has received makes it possible for this school to do a little more than most of their competitors are doing and to do it, in some cases, a little better. To this extent the college is innovative. But North is developing, expanding, refining essentially familiar themes. Where much has been given, much is expected. What North might have done, we suggest, would have been to look less to certain elitist colleges for models. North could have in the recent past and could still, given its resources, lead the way in bringing persons and programs together in new academic configurations. But that would define innovation as something more than the improvement of the status quo.

From the evidence, North College does not care to be experimental, as we have defined the word, and is interested in innovations only so long as they advance the school toward the goal of conventional institutional excellence. We wonder if it will be North's fate to achieve conventional excellence just at the time such standards have been abandoned as unworthy by those colleges North had hoped to impress.

These comments, containing explicit or implied criticism, are not aimed at urging North toward more social liberalism. The college has been, we think, a conservative school moving slowly, and perhaps wrongly, in a liberal direction. Maybe it should be unapologetically conservative. North has a conservative constituency and funding base, although the students and faculty have of late been somewhat more liberal politically and socially if not academically. Yet they are far from radical and most are probably more at home with conservatism. Administrators at North seem to feel compelled to promote social liberalization, largely because of the presumed need to provide a compatible setting for a new liberal faculty. However, it should not be difficult, with North's salary schedule, to find conservative faculty (indeed, some evidence suggests that even faculty liberals tend toward conservative values after they have been on campus awhile and begin to think about conserving their privileges).

If we are concerned for diversity in American higher education, then there must be a wide spectrum of political, social and educational perspectives represented through our colleges and universities--at the level of values as well as organizational forms. We must have alternative institutional models. North could innovate with traditional themes and arrangements, and do so from a Christian perspective too seldom represented these days in academe. The challenge for this college, whether it takes a conservative stance or not, is to bring all of its considerable resources, financial, intellectual, and spiritual, to bear in a united effort that will result in the constituency, administration, faculty, and students defining for that community the nature of academic excellence for a time of radical social change.

CHAPTER V

MIDWEST COLLEGE

Midwest College has a young, vigorous, and professionally oriented faculty. The dean and the younger faculty are concerned about degrees earned, graduate school specialization and departmental compatibility, research and publications, awards, grants and travel. They do not slight teaching, but they are much more guild-conscious than the faculty of former years. They work for the college, but they also work for their own professional advancement.

The faculty work load has been reduced in the past three years from fifteen hours to twelve and even to nine for a few persons. The cover letter on the 1966 student application listed 55% of the faculty as having Ph.D.'s. In 1962, Cass and Birnbaum had listed 22% at Midwest. A large proportion of the current faculty was educated in the mid-West, getting their terminal degrees at "Big Ten" schools. About 60% took their undergraduate work either at Midwest or another of two colleges related to the same denomination. Many colleges with lower faculty salaries (although Midwest's are not high) and fewer advanced degrees among the faculty can claim a much wider range of geographical and ideological diversity. Administrators say that they have reduced the baccalaureate degree in-breeding problem by 10% in five years but admit that there are still too many faculty members from the same background.

The contract letter for faculty states:

> [Midwest] is a college of the [denomination] and proud of its contribution to the Church. As far as humanly possible, we strive to fulfill in word and deed the precepts of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. It is important that each of us maintain these precepts with our colleagues and students. We respect the confessions of the Church and urge all who are a part of our community of faith to study them in relation to their faith.

Despite this theological stance, the college is concerned to maintain academic freedom and to bring more ideological diversity into the faculty--including in 1967-68 a Catholic and maybe a few discreet agnostics. Also, since our study, the college has arranged to grant tenure to faculty who are not affiliated with the denomination.

The faculty is weighted toward the lower ranks. In 1966-67 there were eighteen full professors, sixteen associate professors, forty-four assistant professors, thirty-one instructors, and two "teaching associates." Improvements in recent years in salaries and benefits and in professional and scholarly arrangements make Midwest attractive to certain faculty. The college offers a comfortable environment--an academically respectable school which still has freedom from much pressure to publish, a geographical area where the cost of living is low, a chance to work with obedient students who respect authority--all of this in an environment which provides religious men with religious ambience. Therefore, Midwest probably has a relatively large number of people who have some mobility but who would not leave it.

Still there is considerable turnover in the faculty. Given Midwest's financial condition and forty-four assistant professors, personnel shifts seem inevitable. This fact, along with the school's growth in the student population, explains the presence of twenty new faculty in 1966-67 and twenty-two in 1967-68. None of these were "name" faculty; most were young (the increase in instructors was pronounced). The dean's strategy seems to be to get two or three outstanding leaders--teachers and, hopefully, scholars--per division, if not per department, and put young people around them. An example of the effectiveness of this plan is seen in the department of biology. Five years before our study all members of that department had resigned. A chairman, capable but without national standing, was brought into that vacuum and through the intervening years has built one of the strongest departments in the college. As yet, there is no evident division in the faculty between the "cosmopolitans" and the "locals."

The financial condition of Midwest has been and remains an obstacle to Midwest's ambitions. About 80% of the regular operating budget comes from student fees. The endowment is less than $2,000,000. The development staff has been raising about $1,000,000 per year from external sources. Included in this figure is approximately $200,000 given annually by the church. The church, thus, is not now a major source of financial support.

There appears to be a feeling of inferiority in the Midwest community as regards a competitive college, particularly due to Midwest's comparative financial limitations. As an interviewer was told, however, the faculty tend to compensate for this feeling by emphasizing their youth, vigor, and ability to do more with their limited resources.

The rise of conventional criteria for excellence in the faculty is, we think, one of the developments that has come to characterize Midwest College during the tenure of the new administration. Moreover, these considerations are emphasized in the literature and by administrators as important to the institution's self-perception. These developments are, we think, an expansion in institutional emphases more than substitutions for earlier emphases. The commitment to historic Protestant Christianity remains, but has been opened and extended considerably. The dean, who has been pressing for a more scholarly and liberal emphasis at Midwest, also contends that the most distinctive quality of the college is the religious nature of the community. Religion provides unity and continuity in the curriculum--students are involved with courses in religion in the freshman, sophomore, and junior years--and the religion faculty is academically strong and politically influential. Within the past six years there has been a marked shift in the theological emphases of the college. This was in part due to the merger, in 1960-61, of a very conservative parent body into the larger denomination and, furthermore, due to the resignation and departure of an earlier Department of Religion faculty and their replacement by a more "liberal" group. So, the theological commitment of the college has been changed but not dropped and, additionally, it has been extended to include contemporary issues such as civil rights and the ecumenical movement.

The President of Midwest believes that the religious climate is the college's most distinctive feature. But again the concept is extended. He sees the college as the "cutting edge for the church" and he is prepared to live with the friction this working relationship creates with some church people. The president's occasional sermons are distributed to the constituency and by them constituents are "educated" to accept the fact that the educational experience at Midwest is a combination of security and risk.

Midwest College is frequently called, in conversations and in printed materials, "a community of learning and a community of faith." The concept of community is very important, and is another point of distinction in the college's self-perception. The academic community is called "a vital link between the Church and the world" and "a Christian community engaged in higher education." The role of the community of faith is emphasized in daily quasi-voluntary chapel programs. Students are told:

> Students who come to [Midwest] for their education join a community that gathers once each day, Monday through Friday, for the expression and communication of common concerns and faith.

Also:

> The daily worship service. . . is not designed primarily for individuals who want to worship God, but for a community existence under God in which the individuals assume responsibility to and for the community by their presence. . .concern. . . participation and contribution.

An honor code, applicable to academic matters only, is just one of several special features in the academic program at Midwest. Foreign study provisions are also emphasized, including the "Washington semester," a student exchange program, an Institute in American Studies for Scandinavian Educators, and a Latin American Studies program. A Norwegian-American museum is located in the town and is a source of pride and historical information for local citizens and college people.

The school has made a number of curriculum innovations, including the interim term (January of each academic year); a tri-college interim abroad; interdisciplinary programs such as the Freshman Core history of western civilization, literary masterpieces of the western world, and an introduction to Christian theology; and social service intern work in various parts of the country--including Sauk Center, Minnesota, of Sinclair Lewis' Main Street, which turns up as a place where students can do intern work in the Reformatory for Women.

Midwest College is a member of the Central States College Association--a consortium of twelve church-related liberal arts colleges. As a result, students and faculty have opportunities for field research projects, study tours, and cultural and artistic enrichment programs that go beyond the resources of individual institutions. Through these activities, the members of the college extend their experiences beyond their locality.

The students at Midwest come mainly from the small towns and rural parts of Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Illinois. Most are affiliated with the denomination, are orthodox to liberal, and have standard American values. Although students are told in college literature that success depends largely upon "the student's self-management and his campus citizenship," the programs of the college to which the student is expected to give himself are arranged to take up almost all of his time, and the rules of the college see to his citizenship. The life of the student is heavily structured with all sorts of social, athletic, and religious activities. In these areas students participate actively in governance--there are five major committees on which students sit. To date, they have not been involved in academic policy formation or in academic governance. Administrators stated that, in their opinion, students were concerned about food, dorm hours for women, and the honor code, but had no desire to be on faculty committees where academic policies were made.

Furthermore, they said, the atmosphere of the college is very open, access to the leadership of the college is easily arranged, communication between all levels is free and frequent. The president, for example, has a weekly luncheon with the four vice presidents and certain other administrators, as well as a few faculty and some student body officers. There is seldom an agenda, meetings are relaxed and "any issue" may be raised.

Midwest administrators declared to us their willingness to see students become more formally and actively involved in educational policy matters but the students, they felt, must first see the need and demand participation--they are not yet ready themselves. Nor, apparently, are the faculty. One administrator suggested that the issue of student participation in academic policy formulation was more threatening to faculty than to administration. Another said that the student course evaluation form now in use on a voluntary basis could help to create student interest in academic matters and impress faculty with student concerns, but, he said, faculty did not share his enthusiasm.

The faculty at Midwest appeared at the time of the study to be increasingly interested, not in student participation, but in their own involvement in matters of general institutional governance. Some of the younger element, said one administrator, were pressing for more specific policies regarding faculty ranks, salaries, tenure, professional leave privileges, and so on. One specific issue concerned the place of assistant professors in the academic senate. They are not now voting members of the senate, and this means, when instructors are added in, that well over half of the full-time teaching staff cannot vote on faculty policy matters. The young members are impatient with this arrangement.

The college administration has generally encouraged faculty discussion on this and other issues, but seems committed to a slow and cautious change of policy. Several commented that the traditions and procedures of the college might easily be disrupted by introducing a large number of comparatively new and inexperienced assistant professors into the academic senate. Furthermore, given Midwest's location, perhaps there will be considerable flux and movement among younger faculty, so they may have little to contribute. Perhaps a better policy, said one administrator, would be to give early advancement to promising young professors into the associate rank and hence into the senate.

This problem, we suspect, will worsen as the college grows. It is a development assured by financial pressure and the need to utilize available facilities. As more assistant professors and instructors are brought in, as necessitated by the ascendancy of faculty in the job market nationally and the unfavorable bargaining position of a small liberal arts college, pressure will build. Finally, the problem will be accentuated by the presence of the very diversity Midwest seeks. Newcomers for whom the college traditions have little meaning, and who are themselves capable and strong-willed, will press for changes that make professional sense to a professionally oriented faculty.

An examination of school publications and interviews with administrators indicate that Midwest College plans no change in its stated educational philosophy, but its traditions appear to be yielding to evolutionary change. This change was initiated by the college's decision to improve the academic quality of its faculty as well as to broaden its social and religious representation. The incentives for these changes were inherent in the situation but the initiative for them seems to us to be coming from the chief administrators, the president and academic dean.

If these changes continue, Midwest may well expect to experience an increased questioning of the relevance of Christian faith and the Judeo-Christian tradition for contemporary social and political problems, as well as an intensification of the academic program of the college. Both are developments likely to produce strains for the college's cherished concept of a religiously based community. The geographic and social bases of student enrollments are not likely to change greatly but the composition and character of the faculty may be radically altered.

Faculty Data and Student Data

At the faculty level, our questionnaire was mailed to forty-seven persons from a total of 111, thus to 42% of what we regarded as the full-time teaching faculty including all ranks. Faculty returned thirty-three questionnaires, a 72% response from the sample and a 30% representation of the total faculty.

The student questionnaire was given to the entering freshman class of 1966-67. Completed questionnaires totaled 498, a little better than 27% of the students actually enrolled.

Questionnaire items on the matter of educational philosophy and objectives, used with both populations, give clues about the extent to which faculty and entering students were aware of these emphases. Midwest faculty respondents showed that the procedures followed when they were employed contributed to their understanding of the broad purposes of Midwest College. The actual question and the results (%) from the Midwest sample were as follows:

> When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the particular task for which you were being considered? (Please check one.)

	%	
FQ1	12	Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed, at greater length than the particulars of the job.
	67	About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job description.
	3	The institutional philosophy and educational purposes were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.

%

15 The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would relate thereto.

3 No response

In the later free response section of this item about a quarter of the Midwest respondents made it known that at the time of job negotiations they were already well acquainted with the general objectives of the college. When this fact is joined with data provided through the structured response options, it is evident that the stated purposes of the college are well known to faculty.

SQ46 Freshmen were asked how much they knew about the "general philosophy" of the college they had just entered. They were given three response options. Forty percent answered, "Know a lot about it," 56% said, "Know a little about it," and only two percent checked "Don't know anything about it." Apart from the three colleges founded less than five years before the time of the study, Midwest students claimed to have more knowledge of the school's general philosophy than any of the other institutions.

SQ44 When asked whether they thought their college had "some special quality that distinguishes it from other colleges and universities," the freshmen were strongly affirmative in their response. Eighty percent said that "It has a special distinguishing quality," whereas only 19% thought it was "Not greatly different from other colleges." In the space provided to amplify affirmative responses on distinctive characteristics, Midwest freshmen emphasized its sense of community or social cohesiveness along with its Christian tradition. Data derived from the faculty is in agreement with that from the students as well as the college literature and the administrator interviews with regard to the unity of purpose and the cohesiveness of the Midwest community.

Given this distinctive quality, it should not be surprising to learn that Midwest freshmen have a more orthodox religious orientation than is true of students from any other schools in the study. In the student questionnaire, when asked how important religion was to them, 80% of the SQ18 Midwest freshmen called it "Important," 16% said "Somewhat important," and 4% "Not important." When asked in another question to report how they SQ24 thought of themselves apart from any formal religious affiliation, 20% said "I am deeply religious" and 74% said "I am moderately religious." The proportion professing to be "Largely indifferent to religion" was 4%, with less than 1% "Basically opposed to religion"--the smallest group in any participating institution of the study. The 74% "Moderately religious" was second highest, and the 20% who indicated they were "Deeply religious" topped the institutional sample for affirmative religious convictions.

The faculty questionnaire carried a nearly parallel item. It read (with the Midwest and the composite institutional totals included):

FQ16 Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how would you describe yourself in the area of religion?

%		
Midwest	CIT	
36	14	Deeply religious
42	33	Moderately religious
6	28	Largely indifferent to religion
6	11	Basically opposed to religion
3	4	Prefer not to answer
6	7	No response

The faculty's religious commitment matches that of the students. Both seem to relate harmoniously to the religious dimension of Midwest's educational philosophy.

FQ11 Given the religious orientation of the faculty and students, one might inquire about the goals of education they most value. From a list of commonly heard objectives, faculty responded by naming as their first choice, "Development of the ability of the person to think and to understand the consequences of his actions" (85%), with "Development of individual capacity for good judgment" as second (36%). "Preparation for vocation or profession" was the preferred (36%) third choice. This order of preference is the same as found in the CIT, although the proportion of Midwest faculty selecting the think-with-consequential-reference option was more than twenty percentage points higher than the CIT.

Freshmen also were asked about their educational objectives, and their first and second choices are listed below in percentages:

SQ2

First Goal	Second Goal	
52	17	To master certain techniques applicable to my vocation or field of special interest.
21	22	To acquire and use the skills and habits involved in critical and constructive thinking.
6	20	To attain a satisfactory emotional and social adjustment.
16	25	To develop a broad general outlook and familiarity with a variety of subjects.
5	14	To acquire knowledge and attitudes basic to a satisfactory family life.

The vocational focus among these students puts them second in the total sample on that dimension of the questionnaire item. Certain colleges came close to Midwest, but a few schools had student scores separated by twenty percentage points from the Midwest results. The Midwest students ranked comparatively low in declaring a preference for critical thinking as a prime educational objective.

The general conclusion we draw is that Midwest's incoming freshmen are conventional in their thinking about educational goals and that there is a familiar gap between student expectations and goals emphasized by faculty, but that this gap is not so great in comparison to other colleges as to create orientation difficulties between students and their faculty-molded learning environment.

Other aspects of the academic program at Midwest seem to be just as easily reconciled with faculty and students. The faculty show a preference for the standard of conventional institutional excellence, as shown by their responses in the following faculty questionnaire item:

FQ2 The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution.

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	Midwest	CIT	Midwest	CIT	Midwest	CIT
Personal View (%)						
Many motivated, hard-working students	97	79	3	20	0	0
A sense of community	64	36	33	50	0	12
Opportunity for professional advancement	36	55	52	38	12	6
Availability of research money and facilities	9	51	70	38	21	9
An enlightened, skillful administration	94	70	6	27	0	2
An emphasis on teaching	94	61	6	32	0	6

-continued-

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	Midwest	CIT	Midwest	CIT	Midwest	CIT
Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.	58	66	39	29	3	3
Opportunity to influence departmental policies	54	52	36	37	9	10
Geographical location	3	33	42	48	54	18
Inter-disciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities	67	41	33	45	0	13
View of Others (%)						
Many motivated, hard-working students	88	63	9	29	0	1
A sense of community	52	25	49	52	0	12
Opportunity for professional advancement	46	64	46	26	3	2
Availability of research money and facilities	21	51	67	34	12	6
An enlightened, skillful administration	85	48	12	38	0	4
An emphasis on teaching	82	32	18	48	0	12
Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.	54	45	33	41	9	4
Opportunity to influence departmental policies	64	42	33	44	3	4
Geographical location	6	21	73	59	21	9
Inter-disciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities	46	17	52	53	3	21

The preceding results reflect not only conventional liberal arts college values but also the faculty's commitment to purpose and community, the comparative lack of research emphasis, the importance of the administration, the willingness to teach, and the effect of location. The respondents show a high degree of consensus concerning the primary institutional objectives and the expressed values of the present college leadership.

Another question in the faculty instrument asked respondents to gauge the theoretical importance that certain professional activities had for them personally and, also, for their colleagues. The Midwest responses are compared with the CIT as follows:

FQ12 Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	Midwest	CIT	Midwest	CIT	Midwest	CIT
Personal View (%)						
Teaching in the area of academic specialization	79	83	21	15	0	1
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	30	26	54	55	12	17
Research and writing	30	66	48	27	21	5
View of Others (%)						
Teaching in the area of academic specialization	79	72	18	17	0	2
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	36	23	52	60	6	8
Research and writing	21	48	67	36	6	6

The dominance of the Midwest tradition, with its emphasis on local service to students and church, is still evident. But the above-listed statistics put the Midwest faculty sample close enough to the records compiled at institutions with a professionally oriented faculty to suggest a challenge to the supremacy of Midwest's traditional values.

Data will not support the conclusion that the extension of professional standards in the faculty at Midwest means that this faculty must, therefore, be hostile to academic innovations. Three items from the questionnaire bear on the faculty's general attitude toward innovation:

FQ15 Radical technological changes in our society necessitate radical changes in the educational experiences offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different.

	Midwest (%)	CIT (%)
Strongly agree	15	19
Agree	52	40
Can't say	12	11
Disagree	18	20
Strongly disagree	0	3

FQ15 Too much emphasis is presently being placed on innovation and experimentation in higher education. Existing standards and arrangements are sound, and these should be achieved and utilized--not replaced.

	Midwest (%)	CIT (%)
Strongly agree	0	3
Agree	9	17
Can't say	3	12
Disagree	70	48
Strongly disagree	15	17

		Personal View (%)		
		Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
FQ2	(The importance of): An opportunity for experimentation and innovation	58	42	0
		View of Others (%) (Faculty colleagues)		
		39	58	3

These responses from the sample do not make Midwest a leader among participating schools in the matter of innovation, but there does appear to be support for innovation there.

Turning to specific curricular details (i.e., grades, units and course requirements) the Midwest faculty sample sided, albeit rather gingerly, with a response configuration that puts them on the side of change in their responses to the following statement:

FQ14 There should be less emphasis on grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements.

	Midwest (%)	CIT (%)
Strongly agree	12	21
Agree	67	42
Can't say	15	6
Disagree	6	24
Strongly disagree	0	4
No response	0	1

The entering freshman class sample at Midwest divided on the matter of conventional grading arrangements, but the general impression from their responses was that, more than most, these students were favorably inclined toward conventional procedures. One indication of this conventionalism can be seen in their relative satisfaction with the grading procedures:

SQ30 How do you feel about competing with other students for grades and recognition?

%	
9	I very much dislike it and prefer to avoid it
24	I dislike it somewhat
21	I have neutral feelings about this
37	I like it somewhat
10	I like it very much

Another indication came when Midwest student respondents were invited to theorize about the characteristics of an ideal college. Most of the student participants in the institutional samples, including Midwest, showed a marked preference for those characteristics that are, we think, on the side of innovation rather than convention--they overwhelmingly favored an emphasis on independent study, they much preferred group discussion to lectures, they wanted a broad, general program rather than a specialized one. But on the scale dealing with pass-fail versus letter grades, responses from all segments of the student population were more evenly divided. There were three notable exceptions, with the report from two colleges going toward pass-fail and toward letter grades in one. Otherwise, the samples were split and the results at Midwest are fairly representative of that situation. The general question and the particular items were:

SQ47 If you were to choose an ideal college, which of the following features would you prefer to have?

Courses graded "pass" or "fail"	34%	or	Courses given letter grades (A,B,C,D,F)	65%
Little competitiveness for grades and recognition	54%	or	Much competitiveness for grades and recognition	45%

We find in the above further confirmation for our argument that the entering freshmen at Midwest are oriented to conventional standards of excellence and to the more traditional curricular safeguards for it.

A third item related to the "ideal college" question in a more general way:

College traditional in most respects	71%	or	College experimental in most respects	27%

Some doubts are raised as to whether these freshmen have a very clear idea about what they mean when stating a preference for a "college traditional in most respects" when their responses to two other questionnaire items which contain substantive challenges to traditional academic arrangements are shown. Here is one such question:

SQ58 Which of these statements comes closer to your own view?

1) Students should be given very great freedom in choosing their subjects of study and in choosing their own areas of interest within those subjects.

2) There is a body of knowledge to be learned, and the faculty is more competent than the student to direct the student's course of study, through required courses, prerequisites, and the like.

Midwest respondents favored the second and more traditional position, but rather narrowly: 54% to 45%.

But on the second of the items where conventional, traditional arrangements can be challenged, the Midwest sample took another tack:

SQ57 Should students participate significantly in the content and organization of courses, academic policy decisions, and matters of this sort?

At Midwest, 56% answered "Yes," 30% chose "Maybe," only 6% said "No," and 7% answered "Don't know." The 56% result in the affirmative was the highest proportion taking this option in any institutional sample. Correspondingly, the percentage at Midwest saying "No" was next to the smallest in the total study. Do these data imply that these freshmen, who do claim to know quite a bit about their college, enter Midwest with the notion that the administration of the academic program there has been too restrictive and that, despite the friendly informal communication that characterizes the place, student views and contributions in these areas are not being effectively utilized? Our interviews with the administration had led us to expect a neutral-to-negative response to this question. Does the overwhelmingly positive response indicate that there is a problem of communication between the students and the administration on this particular issue?

The matter of student involvement in academic governance is one where the students are clearly more innovative than faculty. Keeping in mind that 56% of the freshmen thought students should take part in academic affairs and only 6% rejected this participation, one can note a considerable difference of opinion in the faculty concerning a similar (but not identical) question:

FQ4 Should students at your college participate more significantly than they do at present in the formulation and implementation of academic policies, i.e., in establishing the content and organization of courses, on academic policy committees, by student-formed and student-led seminars?

Midwest (%)		CIT (%)
39	Yes	34
61	No	62
0	No response	4

This is surprising in view of data stated earlier showing Midwest faculty apparently more disposed to modifications in the letter grade formula than students were.

The faculty's response to a question concerning student participation in social decisions indicated that they were opposed to this as well. In this respect, they were among the most conservative of our institutions. The question and results were as follows:

FQ15 The concept of in loco parentis is unnecessary and undesirable because students should have the freedoms and responsibilities of adults.

Midwest (%)		CIT (%)
9	Strongly agree	15
15	Agree	38
9	Can't say	11
61	Disagree	25
0	Strongly disagree	3
0	No response	2
6	Variant responses	6

The concern for community at Midwest--a concern that has been declared to be of vital interest by a strong majority of both faculty and students--appears to mean for the majority of faculty a community where there is equality of participation for students in religious life, but qualified participation for students socially and academically.

Conclusion

The Midwest record is quite clear. Academically average students with above average religious motivation and a very definite concern for vocational preparation come into the presence of a competent, hard-working teaching faculty that is beginning to change its ideas about what constitutes a satisfying professional life without as yet changing its conventional thinking about the rights and privileges of students. The administration has been in recent years making provisions for faculty that are of importance to them--better salaries, reduced teaching loads, more mobility, and national exposure--as well as interpreting the new faculty ethos to students while waiting for students to develop a new ethos on their own.

The students, meanwhile, seem to be developing ideas about student participation in academic governance which have not yet been expressed to the administration. The generally-shared concern for community, the willingness on the part of the faculty to innovate and on the part of the administration to encourage and accommodate demands--these and other ideas gathered through our contact with Midwest led us to believe that innovation will be used to increase the student's involvement in his own learning experiences and to reconcile contending factions within the college. Innovations will be used to alleviate differences and, finally, to integrate them.

We suspect, however, that changes taking place at Midwest will be innovative rather than experimental. The high degree of consensus concerning the primary institutional objectives will not be easily shaken. The educational standards at Midwest will, for the time being, be determined by the national standard of conventional excellence.

CHAPTER VI

UNIEASTERN

The addition of UniEastern to the Institutional Character project in the spring of 1967 was occasioned mainly by a desire to include another institution that was definitely in transition, another case study of the processes of change. UniEastern had gone from private to public auspices, from small to intermediate size, from few and comparatively simple programs to diverse and complex ones, from an imitative stance to one supposedly innovative.

Founded as a private institution in 1766, UniEastern was one of nine colonial colleges. But in 1864 it became the state's land-grant college. The main effect of this change was to give the university the schools of agriculture and engineering and, eventually, a large ROTC program. UniEastern was designated as the state university in 1917 and in 1945 it was incorporated along with various divisions it had been gathering.

UniEastern's growth has been due in part to its willingness to incorporate isolated units--a college of pharmacy, schools of law and business administration, as well as another campus specializing in professional schools.

It had been announced prior to the study that future developments at UniEastern, particularly regarding undergraduate programs, would be built on the federated college model. By the use of this concept, older established units could move ahead in their own way and at their own pace, while the university grew by rapidly expanding facilties, programs, and personnel in new colleges. Innovation and experimentation could be tried in the new units without upsetting the traditional order within older programs; conventional wisdom would not be uprooted but new insights might be planted. The tension of differences would, hopefully, benefit both traditionalists and innovators.

The federated plan for colleges seemed especially appropriate in a state that had been slow to develop a master plan for higher education or to provide a clear delineation of the role of the state university vis-à-vis other educational institutions. There are only a few community colleges in the state, although many are projected, and the state college system is weak. Many of the state's students, particularly those of high intellectual aptitude, have gone to schools out of the state. Some observers believe that this state's failure to provide for the educational needs of its youth has been scandalous. Developments in the state during recent years show an awareness among political leaders of past deficiencies and present urgencies; yet, at the time of our study, authorities at UniEastern did not know how far statewide planning would go and, therefore, the federated plan seemed best for internal growth and change as well as a way of providing a flexible mechanism for meeting external challenges.

Another view of the establishment of the federated college plan at UniEastern is less favorable to the vision, courage, and creativity of the institution's central administration. This view has it that not until the federal government made known its intention to dispose of a nearby military installation did university people act--and then for the wrong reason. Realizing that UniEastern should move with dispatch to acquire the adjacent military property, administrators began to think of an educational justification for their acquisitive intentions. From this critical perspective, the federated plan looks like academic opportunism--a way to extend the property and power of the university without engendering much internal division.

The truth, project personnel suspect, is that the university was sensitive to the need for a radical expansion of higher education in the state and was fully cognizant that if UniEastern did not move to meet that need the political and social climate was such that other ways would be found to meet it. UniEastern would thus have found its supremacy and its control of higher education in the state threatened. There was, also, an element of educational idealism in the decision to double the size of the university by establishing several new colleges on the old military site. The interest in innovation that has been developing nationally in response to student unrest, social conflict, and the economic complexities of modern higher education, as well as the desire to meet the challenges of the so-called postindustrial age, reached and motivated certain leaders on campus. They knew UniEastern was going to grow. They were also interested in providing ways for it to change.

Theorists of the dynamics of change in complex organizations feel that the following factors are at work whenever considerable institutional alterations are achieved: an ideology that motivates and unifies; a social matrix that has certain features conducive to change and others that challenge through contrast; strong leadership; an effective carrying mechanism to move specific changes forward; and, finally, provision for self-renewal and criticism, because all efforts at change are subject to attrition and compromise and must be constantly reaffirmed and updated. Whereas the federated college plan provided a "carrying mechanism" for change, there was much to be learned about the unifying, motivating ideology for change at UniEastern as well as about the prospects for leadership, regeneration, and support in this institution's own matrix.

The population sample at UniEastern was limited to administrators and faculty in two colleges. One college was the long-established college of arts and sciences, the other the university's college for women. The former had been a loose coalition of schools and departments that was at the time of the study drawing together into a more cohesive unit, the latter had been and remains a small community cohering around a commitment to the liberal arts. Administrators were interviewed, and faculty perspectives were gathered through a questionnaire. The faculty questionnaire was distributed in the spring of 1967 to 174 persons at the college which is here designated as U-A and to ninety-eight persons at U-B College, all of whom were involved part-time or full-time in teaching undergraduates. At U-A the sample polled was 42% of the total staff of 415, and the U-B sample was 43% of 228. Questionnaires were also given to a few persons then planning the first of the new colleges, and their responses have been included in the returns for U-A. U-A faculty returned fifty-one questionnaires, 29% of those polled and 12% of the total faculty there. Twenty-five questionnaires were returned from faculty at U-B; this was 26% of those polled or 11% of the total faculty in that college. One questionnaire from U-A and two from U-B were returned too late for inclusion. But the rate of return was still lower at UniEastern than at all but one of the project's participating institutions. One reason, no doubt, was that our questionnaire was circulated late in the academic year and faculty by this time were probably suffering from physical and psychic fatigue. Another possible reason for the comparatively low rate of return was that the UniEastern faculty had passed through a period of considerable controversy over the federated plan in the late winter and early spring of 1967 and they may have been uneasy about the intent of our inquiry in the context of institutional uncertainty. No attempt was made to collect student data due to the unfavorable circumstances engendered by the time of year when it was necessary to carry out project assignments.

Administrative Perspectives on Philosophy and Objectives

The U-A catalog for 1967-68 carried several paragraphs that explained the shield of the U-A coat of arms, and several publications associated with the college (e.g., the freshman handbook) gave space to a history of the university. However, neither the catalog nor the ancillary literature available to researchers articulated U-A's present educational philosophy or its broad institutional objectives. Elsewhere in university publications one can read that "[U-A] continues to uphold the intent of the [---] College trustees as stated in 1771, namely, to pay 'strictest regard...to everything that may tend to render students a pleasure to their friends and an ornament to their species...'" Or, a statement from the inaugural address of the current president was sometimes quoted: "It must therefore always be the ultimate aim of the University to provide the atmosphere and the intellectual conditions in which alone the free spirit can survive." However, beyond such occasional generalizations researchers were unable to find in the literature any expression of concern for the role of the college in the contemporary world that would match the attention given to U-A's history and social traditions.

Are visitors to assume that because the catalog says, "diversity of function is the hallmark of a university," U-A gives no thought to general ideological considerations because, in a university, these are no longer appropriate concerns? Is one to conclude that there are no fundamental normative standards operating in the university? Clearly there are. The university makes value judgments about its history (mostly favorable) and about what it means to be a "U-A man." The freshman Handbook stated: "at [U-A] no one will tell you how to dress or conform to the '[U-A] image' because there is no such thing as a 'typical' [U-A man]." Yet in the same publication a picture showed all frosh wearing dress shirts, ties, and other conventional clothes. So, too, judgments are made about the meaning of liberal education in an institutional setting, for example, the superiority of intellectual analysis over noncognitive learning, the character and importance of academic freedom, the role of the university in modern society. If these and other features of the "integrative value system" exist in the university, but are not stated in the catalog, how are they conveyed? Are they more caught than taught? Should they be spelled out in the literature of specific university programs? They are not found in the U-A catalog. In the catalog of the other college of our study, U-B, there is a short and general statement:

> The purpose of the College is to discover and to develop the possibilities for growth in its students, so that they may find the fullest satisfaction in rich and responsible personal lives

> and serve usefully as citizens of a democracy. The College believes that a sound liberal education, in which both practical and ultimate values should be sought, offers to most young women the best means for attaining these objectives. However, since a liberal education does not completely meet the varied needs of all its students, the College offers also courses in important professional fields. By this two-fold offering it aims to serve adequately both the individual and the State.

Whereas in one college, then, nothing is made explicit about educational philosophy, in the other we find a statement that is almost qualified away. The conclusion of the project researchers is that the publications of UniEastern did not at the time of the study help one to understand the formal propositional stance of the university. UniEastern, while very concerned for its historic image, meant apparently to convey the substance of that image by function, act, and attitude rather than pronouncements.

What impressions came from interviews with administrators that might indicate the educational philosophy and broad institutional purposes of this university? First, these conversations gave the impression that general policies were formulated mainly by the university president and a few of his administrative colleagues, and that such policies were usually conveyed by various informal means to other administrators and lesser functionaries. Chief administrators knew that matters of the curriculum were in the control of faculties, but they also knew that they had leverage with those faculties through control of or influence over certain rewards and sanctions. Therefore, leadership by administrators at the level of general institutional planning was thought to be possible.

The administrative style at UniEastern was patterned after English antecedents and, we were told, this meant that informal contacts were preferred to formal statements, personal leadership was favored over programmatic, systematized arrangements. University leaders, it was said, were not ideological but pragmatic, more likely to operate with short-term plans and improvised schedules than on fixed, long-range ones. There seemed to be general agreement that this style had been effective in the past at UniEastern, but some concern was expressed as to its adequacy for a greatly expanded institution with a complicated future.

Researchers concluded that the literature of the university faithfully reflected the position of key administrators regarding major philosophical questions. These leaders assumed the adequacy of the liberal tradition; they were confident that the values of the society were basically sound, that the university served those values, and that this relationship could be assumed without being constantly asserted or constantly reaffirmed. They were aware of the social malaise in this country, but they did not believe it to be the place of the university to take a particular position on controversial issues. Rather, the university was meant to provide a setting in which contending points of view could be heard and where representatives of differing philosophies and causes might safely study and teach. UniEastern was proud of its defense of academic freedom. But the university itself was not thought of by the chief administrators to be an agent of social change. Whether they were aware of the extent to which the university has been and is an agent of the social *status quo* was not clear. That it was to serve the society was certain; just what elements of that society it was serving, and why, did not seem to be regarded as matters for continual review. Therefore, an educational philosophy was operating but was not announced and, perhaps, not even understood.

On the question of the university's role in the state, administrators gave the visitor the impression that UniEastern for many years had been sensitive to the charge that the best students of the state were going elsewhere for their higher education and that this problem was especially serious at the graduate and professional levels because students trained outside the state were unlikely to return to the state and establish themselves there professionally after their training was completed. Thus the state had suffered a braindrain, a concern to industry as well as to education. It was expected that expanding UniEastern into a first-rate, complex university with a wide variety of advanced programs would help solve this problem.

No compromise with academic quality was anticipated during the university's expansion period. If UniEastern was concerned for charges of elitism, administrators gave no sign of it. They were, in fact, concerned for qualitative improvement even during the time of quantitative expansion. This was the university's chance to move up into the first line of universities in the nation and, it was said, all energies were to be directed to that goal.

Administrators appreciated UniEastern's obligation, on the other hand, as the state university, to extend and improve undergraduate educational opportunities. This, indeed, was the principal rationale given for the proposed organization of three new, large (3500 students) undergraduate colleges on the newly acquired 500-acre site. This also influenced consideration at the time of the study to establish one of those new units as an "upper division college," featuring programs of special value to graduates of the state's budding community college program. The state legislature, it was said, had authorized a community college in each of the state's thirteen counties. Thus, in the near future 10,000 to 15,000 students could be graduating from county-run junior colleges and inquiring about transfer into the state university. Considering that the university's present yearly rate of student attrition was 6%, an attrition which made possible the introduction of only about 250 transfer students per year, the pressure of this situation could be great.

UniEastern needed to expand if the state was serious about keeping students in the state for their higher education and if UniEastern was to continue its monopoly as the state university. The political ramifications of this situation were also apparent. The counties would be supporting community colleges, but would a state legislature with close political ties to these counties be willing to support UniEastern financially if the university embarrassed the community colleges by refusing to accept their graduates? The tension between UniEastern's two goals--improving the university qualitatively while also serving a greatly expanding constituency--was evident in the speculations and reflections of administrators during project interviews.

There were problems no less difficult within the university regarding the purposes, objectives, and relationships for UniEastern undergraduate colleges.* There was no apparent concentration among key administrators on securing agreement or understanding at the level of educational philosophy as an essential prerequisite to programmatic planning and the delegation of responsibilities by schools. Philosophical presupposition may have, again, been assumed, and assumed acceptable to all parties, but the parties interviewed did not show any such shared understanding.

---

*The Institutional Character project did not give attention to graduate and professional schools.

For example, it was mentioned that the central administration apparently had decided that U-B would be a full participant in the federated college plan and that, additionally, if the U-B faculty were to keep abreast of the professionally oriented faculties presently available or those being secured for expanding programs elsewhere in the university, they would need to show accomplishments in research and writing, association with faculty guilds, and in other professional activities. Some administrators and faculty within U-B were in full agreement with this shift away from the college's historic autonomy and toward professional integration with the university, but insufficient attention was being given to the question of the meaning and place of U-B, qua U-B, in the new university configuration. The question of which criteria would be used to determine the advancement of U-B's faculty, given the school's long-standing emphasis on teaching vis-à-vis the university's developing emphasis on research, was a matter mentioned in administrative interviews as a source of confusion and as an issue that could not be decided without a consensus on priorities. Another issue hotly debated by faculty and students within U-B was its future as a college for women. But, it was pointed out, this issue also had to be seen in the context of larger university developments, and there was insufficient dialogue at this level. Were the prospects within the university under the federated plan good for faculty innovators? Would "change agents" be supported and rewarded by central administration? And what was the prospect for U-B as an innovative college, competing, perhaps, with the newly developing federated college for recognition in this connection?

Confusion existed among administrators as to whether the university really wanted to gain a reputation as an innovative institution. Comments were made by students and faculty that no clear-cut leadership in the area of innovation had been shown by key administrators beyond the acceptance of the federated plan. Although steps had been taken to move the university toward an organizational arrangement within which colleges might become centers of innovation, there were no assurances that if individual colleges actually turned out to be different, that is, to have differing values as well as differing procedures, they could get the support necessary for their success. There were some signs, one administrator said, that the attempts to establish a new and distinctively innovative college were already suffering opposition and that it was likely that the university's financial realities and conservative academic traditions would unite to bring this project to terms with the status quo. Yet, on the other hand, assurances were heard from other administrators that the new college was being given every freedom essential to the success of the innovations proposed thus far. Faculty and administrators associated with the plan, it was said, were not interested in having the college tagged as radically innovative or experimental, but they were determined that it would have a contemporary curriculum and provide opportunities for individualized student programs. Yet, the university's "exacting standards" would be satisfied. The preliminary literature on the program emphasized these points.

It was the university's intention, another administrator reported, to set all-university standards for admission and graduation and yet to permit undergraduate divisions of the university to establish their distinctions within these broad definitions. And, said he, there would be ample opportunity within UniEastern's standard for individual colleges to create a distinctive identity.

Administrators by and large did not expect that the creative, energetic faculty and administrators would congregate in the proposed new colleges, leaving only atrophied old guard at U-B and U-A. Both the older units, visitors were told, would be expected to develop their own distinctiveness under the federated plan. Moreover, administrative arrangements were being set up in 1967 to help provide leadership for the unification of existing programs in agriculture and engineering with arts and sciences to encourage new vitality and create a sense of shared purpose among these components of U-A.

At another interview it was suggested that the faculty might find more opportunity for innovation in "traditionalist" U-A than in either U-B or the new establishments. The latter colleges would tend to think holistically and, therefore, all participants would be required to conform to programmatic emphases. At U-A, conversely, individual faculty members were free to structure their courses, and particular departments or other subunits within the college could innovate without impinging on others. This "freedom" meant opportunities that could lead to unique even more radical changes than would be possible elsewhere. However, project staff wondered whether the faculty person likely to be hired into a college not noted for innovativeness would be the sort to attempt radical changes? Or, if the desire for change were to strike him, would his colleagues long tolerate an unexpected and perhaps unsettling dissimilarity?

The issue that will be mentioned last in connection with the administrative perception of UniEastern's educational philosophy and institutional goals is one that seemed at the time of this study to be of first importance. It was the issue of whether the advocates of U-A as a strong core with several other colleges clustered around it, serving mainly as housing units where students could gain a sense of identity and human fellowship, would prevail over those who were advocating essential parity for all colleges yet considerable autonomy for each one. Some administrators contacted seemed uncertain on this point, perhaps waiting for guidance or still weighing alternatives; others were obviously partisan. The central administration, in staff opinion, favored diversification of programs and personalities. The right of the several colleges to mark out a place for themselves, and the autonomy necessary to do so, seemed to be supported in their plan. They were not so much concerned that the new colleges would get too strong or too separatist as they were concerned that such programs would not have sufficient drawing power in the university to get the faculty they need to assure first-rate standing. The danger, administrators said, was not that the new colleges might overrun U-A or U-B but rather thay they might not muster enough support, particularly respect and professional acceptance, from those colleges to assure equality for the new programs in the university community.

Faculty Perspectives on Philosophy and Objectives

Included in the faculty questionnaire were several items intended to elicit faculty perspectives on the ideological bases or broad institutional purposes of the university. One question read:

> FQ5 What proportion of the present faculty do you consider to be seriously concerned, pro or con, with the formal institutional purposes intended to give direction and character to your college?

Results from U-A and U-B for this item confirm the impression gained from administrative interviews that such matters are not greatly emphasized at this university and that, consequently, most faculty turned their attention elsewhere. Following are the returns for this question:*

	U-A (N=51)	U-B (N=25)
Almost all	8	12
Well over half	22	20
About half	28	24
One-fourth or so	26	24
Very few	12	8
Such things are not the concern of the faculty	0	0
No response	2	8

The proportion of respondents at U-A declaring that "Almost all" of their colleagues were seriously concerned for institutional purposes was among the smallest reported in the study. One liberal arts college sample went slightly lower, and one university sample was in a virtual tie. The composite institutional total (CIT--all faculty, all schools) on this item was 19%. The U-B report seems to confirm the administrative comment mentioned earlier that insufficient attention was being given to the purposes of the college. On a comparative basis, U-B ranks low. One factor influencing this result may be that U-B was experiencing a transition of administrative leadership at the time of the project and this fact combined with uncertainty about the place of the college in the larger university scheme of things caused an especially noticeable problem. It could be argued, on the other hand, that a time of transition is precisely when the purposes, values, and educational assumptions of the college should be under serious faculty analysis and be matters of the deepest concern.

---

*Totals in this and subsequent tables are not always 100% or equal to N, number of respondents, because of rounding and small numbers of variant responses not included.

Another faculty questionnaire item put the issue squarely into the context of the individual respondent's own experience. It included an assumption that if the institution regarded general ideological considerations to be of prime importance to the educational experience offered students, as well as to the future of the institution itself, they would have been emphasized at the time the faculty member was employed:

FQ1 When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the particular task for which you were being considered?

-continued-

	U-A (%)	U-B (%)	CIT
Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed, at greater length than the particulars of the job.	6	4	16
About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job description.	14	20	22
The institutional philosophy and educational purposes were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.	16	32	15
The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would relate thereto.	59	40	40
No response	6	4	7

At UniEastern, according to data gathered from faculty responses, the emphasis at recruitment time was on departmental and professional consideration, although this was less so at U-B than at U-A. Possibly educational philosophy was not emphasized during recruitment because it was assumed that UniEastern's position was known by all parties. This would be a hazardous assumption in a rapidly growing and changing university of this size. Only one campus in the total institutional sample ran higher than U-A on the response rate favoring departmental concentration. Among the smaller liberal arts colleges, only one school had a higher proportion of respondents remembering that negotiations featured departmental and professional considerations than did U-B.

Given the long history of the university and the emphasis that history received on the campus and in the publications, one might have expected that faculty would imply their grasp of institutional purposes by expressing a high regard for the history and traditions of the college. But UniEastern did not stand out on a question where these matters were raised. The question read:

FQ9 Do your colleagues express much loyalty for the history and traditions of this institution? (If you are a faculty member at a new college established within the general framework of a university, apply this question to that university.)

	U-A (%)	U-B (%)
About as much as faculties in similar institutions elsewhere	51	40
More than in similar institutions elsewhere	12	40
Less than in similar institutions elsewhere	28	4
No response	8	12

Research staff could not know what associations respondents made when called upon to put this question in the context of "similar institutions elsewhere," but the assumption made was that U-A people held up Ivy League comparisons while U-B respondents thought in the context of first-rate colleges for women. The U-A faculty reporting "Less than in similar institutions elsewhere" was slightly greater than the CIT (21%), while the one person at U-B who thought the same still left that college in the enviable position of having one of the lowest proportions of faculty seeing less faculty loyalty to the institution than existed elsewhere. If the faculty comparisons were with Ivy institutions or with the "Seven Sisters," then this standard of loyalty measured up well.

Since the issues of the relationship of the university to the state and the responsibility of the university in social reforms were matters debated at UniEastern as well as issues affecting the thrust of the curriculum being devised for the new federated college, it may be useful to report how faculty respondents at U-A and U-B treated two questions having some connection with these themes. Faculty were asked to give their personal response to the following statements:

FQ15 Colleges and universities, as institutions, must assume a larger, more important role in setting the goals and programs of our society.

	U-A (%)	U-B (%)	CIT (%)
Strongly agree	28	24	27
Agree	49	36	44
Can't say	8	12	8
Disagree	6	16	15
Strongly disagree	0	4	2
No response	4	4	2

FQ15 Course work should be more relevant to the social and political realities in the world outside the campus.

	U-A (%)	U-B (%)	CIT (%)
Strongly agree	20	4	12
Agree	24	48	36
Can't say	12	12	13
Disagree	26	24	28
Strongly disagree	6	4	3
No response	4	0	1

The number of U-B respondents disagreeing with the first of the two statements may suggest the presence there of the familiar residual "liberal arts as an end in itself" tradition, although certainly this point cannot be pressed due to the small sample. The comparative lack of "Strongly agree" sentiment for the second statement at U-B might support this point. It may be said with more confidence that these data do not put UniEastern in the vanguard of this project's institutional sample on these themes despite the attention given by administrators to activating the university community toward its responsibility to and in the state. Of course, the administrative campaign may well have promoted the more conventional side of these matters, emphasizing service desired by the community rather than actively defining new forms of service.

In other sections of the questionnaire, UniEastern faculty showed the concern or commitment on which institutional character can be built. FQ11 When faculty were asked to report their own view of the goal of education, a remarkably high 71% of the respondents at U-A and 77% of those at U-B marked the same response option--"Development of the ability of the person to think and to understand the consequences of his actions." This choice was, to be sure, preferred by respondents everywhere, but not with the same degree of agreement. Only one of the other large university campuses measured up to the proportion of UniEastern's faculty marking this option. The strength of the liberal arts ideal in both U-A and U-B, especially at the latter, was very apparent.

It was noted in the introduction that the conventional criteria of institutional excellence made up the standard by which most faculty and administrators measured distinctiveness and even institutional character. The implemental procedures and guidelines originally intended to help achieve the larger purposes and goals of a college or university have become ends in themselves. Having already found that the attention of the faculty sample at the time of their recruitment to UniEastern was on departmental and specialistic considerations, data show that this familiar transfer of the implemental to the absolute has occurred at this institution.

Respondents were asked to comment in two questions on certain current faculty interests and responsibilities. The items listed in these questions are indices of one's attitude toward conventional criteria of excellence. They are shown in the table below, including data on U-A, U-B and the CIT.

FQ12,2

Personal View (%)

	Very important			Somewhat important			Not important		
	U-A	U-B	CIT	U-A	U-B	CIT	U-A	U-B	CIT
Teaching in the area of academic specialization	71	92	83	22	8	15	4	0	1
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	22	20	26	55	56	55	16	24	17
Research and writing	78	64	66	12	32	27	2	4	5
Availability of research money and facilities	76	32	51	16	44	38	6	20	9

Notice from the table the extremely high percentage of respondents from U-B who considered teaching in the area of specialization "Very important." In this they were topped by only one other faculty sample in the study. But the U-A faculty response on this item was no less surprising. Not only were they twenty percentage points below their sister college here, but their 71%, while high in terms of an absolute standard, was second lowest in the institutional sample. Staff were surprised, therefore, on two counts: First, working in the discipline seemed more important to the sample in the college with the deepest roots in the liberal arts tradition, and in that college where more departmental bias might be expected less was found. Second, the U-A faculty sample, at a time when the university was intensifying its professional associations, showed somewhat less commitment to at least some of those values that are everywhere seen as a part of the conventional norms of professional excellence.

Although U-A broke at least slightly away from one university faculty stereotype, it must be pointed out that in the two dimensions of the preceding table dealing with the respondents' notions about the importance of research and writing, and about research money and facilities, the sample from U-A fell back into the predictable pattern. Compared with the U-B people and, indeed, compared with the CIT, they reflected the intensification of the research orientation at the university and acknowledged their own participation in that development.

Another characteristic of the professionally oriented faculty has been an emphasis on the centrality of faculty in the formulation and determination of academic programs. The questionnaire carried an uncompromising quotation by Robert Hutchins in which he seems to carry this theme to its limits. Hutchins wrote:

FQ3
> It is the duty of the faculty to formulate the purposes and programs of the University. The duty of the regents [trustees] is to interpret and defend them.

Eighty-two percent of the U-A respondents and 88% of those at U-B agreed with this statement. The CIT response on this item was 80% "I agree." It may have been, of course, that both UniEastern samples were answering in the context of anxiety about what the university's increasing dependence on the state for funding will mean for its academic autonomy. But the attitude expressed by the faculty on this subject, at least when considering it theoretically, may also indicate a willingness to become more actively involved with the university's administration in the formulation of general policies and new programs. Thus, the decision of the central administration to involve U-A faculty in planning subsequent colleges on the new site may be especially propitious.

While administrators at UniEastern showed a readiness to work with faculty in planning for the future of the university, they also seemed ready to assert leadership in formulating the institution's basic commitments. Researchers got the impression that administrators expected that the faculty would advance the interest of the university in research while administrators would have the responsibility of advancing the university's concern for teaching. One administrator emphasized that faculty determination to move UniEastern into the first echelon of institutions would be the motivation for research, while the administrators' control of rewards and sanctions and their concern for the classroom would be the safeguard of effective teaching. Faculty salary matters at the time of the study were handled by department chairmen and deans. However, while the dean respected the authority of the departments and of the faculty's academic senate (appointments, for example, were approved by senate sections organized along disciplinary lines, and administrators did not intrude on their deliberations), administrators had leverage through their control of the budget. Nevertheless, there was congruence between administrators and faculty on the centrality of the conventional standard of excellence as the means for achieving institutional distinctiveness at UniEastern, and their respective roles within this theoretical framework were clearly understood. Faculty controlled the curriculum and administrators by and large worked through faculty to achieve change in this area. Administrators were the "gatekeepers" between the university's programs and the paths leading to the world beyond the campus. The administration's introduction of the federated college plan was one way to reconcile tradition and innovation. Administrators controlled these broad relationships, and faculty had to be prepared to work with them.

But, of course, developments at one end of the spectrum impinge on those at the other. The state legislature had been conservative in budgeting allocations for the university at the time of the research personnel's association with UniEastern. The effect had been to heighten the budgetary competition at a time of expanded plans among the several schools and colleges within the university. UniEastern had practiced program budgeting to the colleges, with the provost's office and an administrative triumvirate making the final decision on the amount to be allocated to each. This office also controlled "the lines" (job allocations per academic program). The provost stated to his associates that he was willing for these decisions to be made under some other administrative plan, but no one had come up with a viable alternative. The deans acknowledged that they were not prepared to accept responsibility for dividing available money among themselves, nor were they "mature enough," as one put it, to negotiate with each other on the "lines" since it would eventually involve revealing salaries for individual faculty members within colleges. The university had a published salary schedule, but the position of an individual within an academic rank on the scale was information not generally shared by deans across college lines. It would be a source of endless controversy, leaders felt, to have to justify the standing of individual faculty on the salary schedule.

U-B had over the years enjoyed greater autonomy in handling its budget than other programs in this university for reasons acknowledged by all to be historical but believed by some to be irrational. Some U-B people held that the separate budget offered a measure of protection for innovation and program flexibility in the college. Now, however, in changing times at the university, if the amount available through its separate budget proved inadequate to the college's needs--as was, some said, increasingly the case--there was no recourse for the college, no general university resources to which they could turn.

U-B also suffered a pinch at the time of the study in the allocation of "lines." In the year prior to the project U-A had received nine new lines and in the year of the study twenty more, while U-B had received none in either year. Officials at U-B emphasized that this condition, while very unsatisfactory to them, was due to state economics rather than prejudice against U-B in central administration. However, concern was expressed for what would happen to U-B, which emphasizes teaching and the liberal arts when the emphasis in the university has shifted to research, tight specializations, and graduate and professional programs. (Could the very large proportion of faculty at U-B declaring the importance for them of teaching in the area of specialization, as shown on the questionnaire, be a manifestation of this anxiety and evidence of the determination of U-B faculty to establish themselves by the new criteria?)

There was much work to be done, everyone at UniEastern acknowledged, to assure the establishment of an effective, relevant, and fair administrative arrangement for the university's allocation of limited resources under the twin themes of university expansion and college federation. And project staff were concerned to point out that the arrangements finally determined would both reflect and influence the values of the university. But there was yet another reason for university leadership to reflect on these matters. Administrators and faculty have been unified by professionalism. Will it be an adequate basis for authority in the future? Administrators and faculty have shown an interest in innovation. But will the innovations they are interested in help them to reach their goals? Some aspects of the former question have already been considered in this report. Data that bear on the latter one will now be presented.

Two faculty questionnaire items revealed faculty attitudes toward the general themes of change and innovation. Respondents were asked to give their personal view on this statement:

FQ15 Radical technological changes in our society necessitate radical changes in the educational experiences offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different.

Approximately 58% of the faculty respondents in this study (CIT) replied with either "Agree" or "Strongly agree." Just under 23% could not support the statement, and 11% preferred to take no stand. At U-A the project faculty averages were maintained. Sixteen percent said

"Strongly agree," and 37% said "Agree." Those on the negative side of this issue totalled 22%. There were several variant answers, and 8% marked the "Can't say" column. U-B participants totalling 60% were positive on the item while only 12% could not agree. One surprising entry from these data showed 24% of the respondents from U-B electing the "Can't say" response option. Apparently, UniEastern is neither ahead nor behind similar institutions elsewhere in its attitude toward the general prospects for change.

The same result emerged from an item in the faculty questionnaire in which a statement against innovation was made:

FQ15

> Too much emphasis is presently being placed on innovation and experimentation in higher education. Existing standards and arrangements are sound, and these should be achieved and utilized--not replaced.

At U-A about 63% said they disagreed or strongly disagreed, while 26% felt some measure of agreement with the statement. U-B results were about the same, 64% disagreeing and 16% agreeing. Again, 16% at U-B marked "Can't say," while at U-A there were 6% in this category. Comparing these data with those from other colleges and universities again indicates that UniEastern had neither special advantages nor disadvantages in the area of faculty attitudes toward innovation. The general sentiment seemed to favor such change. But will it hold up under prevailing pressure toward status quo conformity?

When the inquiries were personalized and the respondent was expected to respond to the issue of educational innovation in the context of his own professional life, the results showed that he strongly favored it. Persons from both U-B and U-A had no hesitation about endorsing "An
FQ2 opportunity for experimentation and innovation." At U-B 76% of the

sample said it was "Very important." Another 16% said "Somewhat important," and only one person (4%) replied "Not important." U-A people were somewhat less emphatic on the matter, yet 55% marked "Very important," 39% "Somewhat important," and 2% "Not important."

The respondents' view of their colleagues' attitude toward innovation and experimentation may be a less idealistic representation of faculty thinking and a more practical indication of the prospects for change than their self-evaluation. Enthusiasm reflected in the "Personal View" is considerably moderated in the "View of Others" section of the question, yet the majority identified their peers as receptive to change. Following are the "View of Others" data for U-A, U-B, and the CIT.

FQ2

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
U-A (%)	26	41	20
U-B (%)	32	40	16
CIT (%)	35	48	8

While UniEastern's respondents saw colleagues as more conservative than themselves, and while UniEastern had a higher percentage of respondents who regarded colleagues as not interested in innovation than are to be found in the CIT, nevertheless, UniEastern faculty were viewed as favorably disposed toward innovation. It is impossible to know, of course, how they defined experimentation and innovation--some may have thought of it as meaning freedom for the professor to organize and conduct his classes according to his own desires, however conventional, while others were thinking in programmatic terms. Nevertheless, respondents affirmed that an opportunity to revise the ways teaching and learning are done, either individually or collectively, was important to them personally and to most of their colleagues.

Questionnaire items dealing with specific forms of innovation elicited much less enthusiasm. Yet there was a surprisingly high level of receptivity to change, even to definite types or forms of innovation. In one questionnaire item faculty were asked to state the theoretical importance to them of three specific innovations--tutorials, team teaching, and cross-disciplinary teaching. In another questionnaire item they were asked to rate interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities according to the importance it had for them personally and for faculty colleagues in their institution. The results for U-A and U-B were as follows:

FQ12		Personal View (%)					
		Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
		U-A	U-B	U-A	U-B	U-A	U-B
	Tutorials and other one-to-one student-faculty learning arrangements	41	36	33	44	16	16
	Team teaching	10	4	28	36	53	56
	Cross-disciplinary teaching	22	20	37	60	37	20
FQ2	Interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities	29	28	51	64	16	4

-continued-

View of Others (%)

	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	U-A	U-B	U-A	U-B	U-A	U-B
Tutorials and other one-to-one student-faculty learning arrangements	10	8	47	64	26	16
Team teaching	2	0	16	20	63	68
Cross-disciplinary teaching	6	4	26	44	57	44
Interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities	10	12	43	48	35	28

Faculty were also asked to indicate the applicability to their FQ14 institution of the following statement: "There should be less emphasis on grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements." Respondents from both of the UniEastern colleges supported the idea. Eighty percent of the U-B sample agreed; only 12% disagreed. At U-A, 70% agreed and 18% disagreed. Considerable faculty support for reforms in this area appeared to be available. Such a generalization cannot be extended, however, to the other specific innovations listed in the preceding table.

Tutorials drew fairly strong support, both when respondents were referring to themselves and with reference to peers. But team teaching was comparatively unpopular. This innovation probably cannot be considered viable at UniEastern. Nor was it well received elsewhere. American college and university professors are apparently too individualistic and too attracted to the tradition of faculty hegemony in the classroom to welcome team teaching. About half the faculty sample at UniEastern were at least open to the idea of cross-disciplinary teaching, and in a university where the departments are very strong, this result can be taken as a hopeful sign for innovation. However, it must also be noted that if only half of the sample will call the idea important, at least half of that number would probably hesitate to take up a specific opportunity to engage in cross-disciplinary teaching. Under the reward system of the university, the results of involvement in work outside the department seem likely to produce more peril than profit. However, if 20% of the faculty in a university with a reputation for arch conservatism regarded two or three different forms of innovation as important to them, the prospects are good that at least modest innovation might prosper. Nevertheless, the impact of such innovations would probably not be sufficiently great to decidedly shape institutional character. Innovation would be regarded as respectable but peripheral in the basic program of the college, promoted by interesting but eccentric members of the community.

Other data show that an estimate of 20% or so as active agents of innovation in the UniEastern faculty may be accurate. Questionnaire respondents were asked to rate their faculty colleagues in each of five categories. The two major categories and the responses to them are presented below:

FQ19 Willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures.

	Most	About half	Some	Very few
U-A (%)	8	20	59	10
U-B (%)	20	8	52	16
CIT (%)	20	23	43	9

-continued-

Not hostile to innovation, but unwilling to get involved personally.

	Most	About half	Some	Very few
U-A (%)	20	33	35	6
U-B (%)	20	44	24	4
CIT (%)	18	30	35	11

A few generalizations from these data are possible: First, more than half of the respondents in both colleges thought that more than half of their faculty colleagues would be unwilling to get involved personally in innovation. Second, another 40% of these samples thought that "Some" of their peers would be willing personally to participate in such ventures. This suggests that it would not be inaccurate to claim that approximately one-fifth to one-fourth of the faculties in these UniEastern colleges might be willing to become involved in the institution's plans for innovation.

Faculties in these two colleges seem ready to take an active role, as mentioned earlier, in the formulation and implementation of change. FQ18 They were asked: "Who...has the most powerful voice in determining the educational policies, i.e., the general objectives rather than the particulars of a given program, in your college?" About 20% of the U-A sample said "Chief administrative officer (president, chancellor)," 24% gave the most powerful role to a dean or provost (the "chief administrative officer of your program"), and 26% marked "The general faculty." These positions were shifted around by the U-B sample, which judged that for this college the president was more powerful than the dean (20% for the former and 8% for the latter). However, the faculty at U-B, as at U-A, was regarded as most powerful of all by 36%.

The visiting researcher had gathered from administrative interviews that the initiatives for change at UniEastern had come from administration. Therefore, data showing the faculty perspective on the issue were important. The questionnaire item read:

FQ8 Where have the initiatives come from for recent changes in your institution?

	U-A (%)	U-B (%)
Faculty	28	36
Administrators	16	12
Students	2	4
External influences (state legislature, constituency, national agencies)	2	0
Faculty and administration	14	8
Faculty, administration and students	4	24

Faculty, through vanity or insight, considered that they were not only "most powerful" in setting general institutional guidelines but also that they had provided the initiative for recent changes in their institution. The visitors' impression was that faculty, here as elsewhere, had an exalted sense of their own importance, and that, furthermore, while the general faculties had no doubt been important in recent changes at UniEastern, the initiatives for change and the guiding control thus far had come from administration. Nevertheless, these faculties have claimed both power and creativity, and perhaps their claims could be put to the test. The staff conclusion was that at UniEastern the faculties are as innovatively inclined as the administration, although neither are radically disposed; that both adhere to the conventional standard of institutional excellence; and, therefore, that innovations directed to the achievement of this goal, and so promoted, have good prospect for success.

The creation of new colleges will require faculties and administrators to think much more and much harder than has been their practice about the fundamental values of the university's educational experience. UniEastern leaders have been slow to reflect on their integrative value system--how they will legitimate the learning experience in their institution in new times. But new colleges must think about these things and, because they do, those colleges around them must think afresh about what they hold in common and how they, symbolizing the "old" ways, relate to those who claim to offer "new" and better ways.

According to those UniEastern administrators interviewed, the faculty of U-A divided on the question of the degree of autonomy to be given new federated colleges. The majority seemed to feel that universitywide standards should be set (based, obviously, on the traditions of existing programs) and that all new programs should conform to them. There could be innovation but innovators should work within the general definitions set down for everybody. One interview yielded a comment containing the following estimate of attitudes: A third of the faculty in U-A would prefer one big liberal arts college for the university with a strengthening of existing departments, and with new colleges providing mainly social opportunities and personalized housing arrangements; a very small number would favor nearly complete autonomy for new colleges, granting them freedom to innovate as they saw fit; and, finally, more than half of the U-A faculty would prefer for all new efforts both freedom and responsibility--freedom sufficient to innovate, responsibility to universitywide standards.

Two areas of conflict, it was said, were admissions requirements for new college students--could such a program use nonintellective variables in the selection process?--and the matter of separate operating budgets for the new colleges. Administrators in the core unit, U-A, were insisting on a shared budget plan, whereas administrators in U-B and the planning coterie of the first of the new colleges were asking for separate budgets to safeguard autonomy.

Student Understanding of University Plans

The meaning of the federated college plan and of the university's inclination to innovation for the students of the several colleges is the last matter to be discussed here. In 1966-67 students in U-A and U-B, according to administrators interviewed, were only vaguely aware of the federated college plan and its significance for them. They were curious about announcements concerning the first new college, especially its coeducational commitment, but they had not participated in the academic planning for the program and were not inclined to extend themselves beyond their immediate interests and the problems in their own college. Student views were solicited when the planning for the facilities for the new college was underway (and according to one report they were very helpful), but neither students nor administrators seemed to realize that if the new colleges were truly innovative there would be significant ramifications in that fact for all phases of student life in the university.

Perhaps the so-called "February uprising" of students (1967), when there was a mild student revolt, was an expression of a subconscious awareness that vast changes were pending. Reports of this event suggested that while students involved were not protesting specific plans for the new colleges, they were expressing a desire to be better informed about university developments and to become more active participants in university planning. They sensed that the federated college plan implied major changes in UniEastern's future and, because the announcement of the plan apparently did not convey the point that everything about it was tentative and subject to change, students felt that they had not been consulted about decisions that vitally affected them. They acted "in typical [UniEastern] style," visitors were assured. Having demonstrated publicly to make their concern visible, students then expressed confidence in the administration and retired from the scene, leaving with the expectation that their views would thereafter be sought and incorporated. Another interpretation of the "February uprising" was that agitation was confined mainly to U-B where some students and certain younger faculty were expressing their anxiety that U-B would, under the federated plan, lose its identiry.

UniEastern students have been effectively utilized at the level of social planning and in student personnel matters, but in 1967 they were not much involved in academic policy formulation. Nor was it likely that they would become active, regular participants until it had been shown at the new college that students had contributions to make. That example, it was said, would have a salutary effect at U-A and U-B. UniEastern had moved from no student participation in university governance only four or five years ago to a considerable involvement in social and personal matters in 1967 and then to certain advisory functions for students at the academic level in the new college, 1967-68. And now, what is being done there appears to be a harbinger of greater participation for students throughout the university in the years ahead.

One of the most exciting aspects of the UniEastern story is the way in which such developments, starting as functional details, quickly lead into the most fundamental considerations and require not only attention to first principles but attention to matters as complex as the administrative reorganization of the university. Thus is illustrated how a modest interest in innovation can lead to considerably bigger things. At UniEastern, basic issues are now emerging from modest beginnings. It remains to be seen whether this university will press on to a position of innovative leadership for American higher education.

CHAPTER VII

EAST UNIVERSITY

The prognostic literature on the future of American higher education, of which there has been an increasing volume in recent years, has uniformly emphasized the trend toward the democratization of colleges and universities. We are told that approximately 40% of college age youth are enrolled in post-secondary institutions but that the percentage will increase to nearly 70% within the next two decades. This development is expected to have profound qualitative as well as quantitative ramifications. Most important will be changes away from the single-model, middle class, elitist value orientation of present institutions of higher education to a diversity of programs and values hardly imaginable in the past but now deemed essential for the realization of the equality of opportunity our democratic ideology requires.

While there will be growth and change at the upper and elitist end of the educational continuum, we anticipate that most of the action will be in junior colleges created to serve the bottom third of this population influx and in mass institutions, mostly public, that are or will be in urban centers. Therefore, what is happening in such places now may well provide models, good or bad, for what will happen for the next several decades of unprecedented expansion and alteration.

The Institutional Character project members wished to learn how a university with the experiences and location of East was likely to relate to all these developments. East is comparatively young, has increasingly diversified programs, is strategically located in a populous, influential metropolitan area, yet is faced with steadily increasing institutional competition. At the time of our contact, the university was populated largely by commuting students, from which the school drew almost all of the finances with which to fund its programs (90% dependent on student fees) and had a meager endowment of $1,000,000. The project staff saw in this combination of opportunities and constraints a microcosm of the situation likely to be facing private universities like East, and those of less privileged and secure status, in the next decade or two. How was institutional distinctiveness being achieved at East when potential and peril seemed so inextricably intermingled? It appeared that at this university courage and ingenuity would be required for survival, and that to build institutional character in this setting would require inspiration and determination.

It soon became apparent through a review of the literature available to the public, and even more from conversations with East's administrators, that the university officials were keenly aware of the institution's limitations as well as its several bright prospects. They were trying to decide how to create a functional operational base, especially with regard to finances, and how to build an institutional character on that base that would sustain and project East into creative growth. Accommodation and character were pivotal considerations in East's planning in the fall of 1966. The implicit tension between the concept of accommodation, implying compromise, and the concept of character, suggesting the lonely splendor of principle, had already become explicit.

Two of the organizational components of this university were included in the study. One was the institution's college of arts and sciences, here designated East-C, and the other was a special and innovative academic sub-unit of the university, here called East-D. Adhering to the regular plan of the research project, contacts were made with students, faculty, and administrators.

The student questionnaire returns from East-C gave a sample of 546, and from East-D a sample of eighty. The Omnibus Personality Inventory was also administered to the freshman class, and these data were available to the project staff.

There were 167 faculty in East-C and six in East-D at the time of the study. Content with comparatively small N's, seventy-two East-C faculty were polled (a sample of 43%) as were all six faculty in East-D. Emphasis was on the undergraduate teaching faculty in the selection of the sample, and the goal was a 20% representation. Forty-two questionnaires were returned from the East-C faculty polled--58% of the sample and 25% of the total. Five instruments were returned from East-D, giving representation from 83% of the total.

The interviewing of key administrators was the third dimension of the study. Seven administrators were interviewed, four of them in several different settings. The principal investigators visited the campus three times.

Additional contacts at East included a luncheon with five student leaders and two informal meetings with small groups of faculty (six individuals). Attention was also given to catalogs, press releases, informal documents, the student newspaper, and several campus reports.

The interviews with East's administrators, as well as the literature, made clear just how this university proposed in 1966-67 to achieve "character through accommodation." First, East intended to move as quickly as possible to gain general university status, offering a wide range of programs that would thereby broaden its base of support by appealing to the needs and interests of a very heterogeneous constituency. The traditional graduate and professional divisions of a first-class university were to be promoted, with first priority to law. Some faculty and administrators preferred to see East do a few things well and they resisted the inclination of the university to jump into new programs two or three years before needed resources were available. Nevertheless, it had been decided a few years before this study to abandon the brief tradition East had established as a liberal arts college and to meet the future as "one of the nation's youngest universities," a university with three distinguishing qualities: "a youthful willingness to experiment; a dedication to the pursuit of scholarly excellence; and an abiding concern for those who--whatever their need--turn to the University."

Student needs about which the university was to be concerned included, apparently, the need for East-C to offer three undergraduate degrees and a variety of Master of Arts programs, a Master of Science in Education, a Master of Business Administration, and advanced study beyond the master's level in several fields. Restraint had been shown, however, in initiating Ph.D. programs, and it was not until the year after the project that modest beginnings were made at the doctoral level.

East is located within a few miles of a competing private university about ten miles or so from an innovative college being established by the state university, an hour's drive from another private university, and about the same distance from yet another campus of the state university. These facts must have contributed to the urgency of East's expansion. A matter of special concern to some of East's administrators, it seemed, was to stake out claims to key programs before new campuses or expanding and opportunistic ones could get ahead of them.

Administrators did speak of plans for cooperation between at least some of these institutions. Monthly meetings have been set up involving administrators of East and the private university close by. They have agreed not to duplicate expensive library acquisitions (single purchases over $300), to offer reciprocal use of library facilities, and to share a Spanish language program, another in classics, and one in inter-American studies. East, researchers were told, would not try to duplicate the other school's fine program in dance and, meanwhile, East had been assured that the neighboring university would not compete for the school of law that, at the time of the study, was designated for the area and which since has been awarded East.

Cooperation with the other private university was less likely, it was said, because of greater distance involved and because of certain personality clashes (the institutions had become extensions of their leaders' personalities). The same problem was perhaps the main reason the neighboring institutions were slow in making a start toward greater efficiency and economy through purposive cooperation.

The main competition for East was expected to come, according to administrative contacts, not from either of the private universities in the area, but from the new campus of the state university, where $110,000,000 was to be spent to establish what the university's president had predicted would be "the most experimental college in the state system and one of the most experimental in the country." There, in the shade of the last great stand of trees for miles around, for the campus site had been a huge estate, students would pay about one-fourth of East's tuition charge.

How would East meet such a formidable challenge? The East way was not only to expand into university programs that would draw students by meeting their individual needs but also to assume an innovative stance for the institution by showing "a youthful willingness to experiment."

East-D was one manifestation of this determination. The year of the study was the year East-D completed its evolution into a three-year degree-granting college of the university. East-D was striving for distinction by close student-faculty relations, opportunity for independent study, a sense of community, and a unique curriculum. But East was innovative in other ways too. A commuter university from its inception, East began arranging in 1966-67 for about 50% of its student body to live on campus while 50% remained commuters. In terms of national practice, this was not innovative, but it was a radical change for East.

The university's decision to build four high-rise dorms with appropriate service facilities, utilizing $10,000,000 or more in federal money, came at a time when students in some universities were rejecting residential collegiate life, particularly the regulations and ethos associated with conventional dorm life. Would students from local communities leave home to live in? Could the university broaden and enrich the socio-economic composition of its community by bringing in students from the northeast and the eastern seabord? Certain administrators had high hopes that this would happen. They wanted to break up the provincialism of East's students and faculty and saw the residential plan as a way to do it. Furthermore, they said, so long as the university had only about $1,000,000 in endowment, and 90% of its operating budget came from student fees, the program of the university was hostage to students. Any class or activity they wanted must be set up, tailored not only to their needs but to their taste. The university had to cater to its clientele. Having 50% of the students in residence could bring new order and stability--students would not directly allocate their tuition dollars to particular courses--and might bring a different type of student.

But there was the rub. Did East really want the type of student likely to occupy their new dorms? Or, indeed, the types likely to respond to the innovations at East-D? East students had been aspirants to the middle class--practical, no-nonsense young people. There had been, to be sure, some sorority-fraternity makebelieve, but that had been peripheral to East's central mission, which had been to educate lower middle-class masses of the metropolitan area. But the students likely to occupy the new dorms would be those who could afford them--students from middle to upper middle class homes. Students attracted to East-D would be "intellectuals" with an idea orientation, not East's job-study types. What would be the consequences? Would East innovate toward the style of the elite just when the national challenge was to educate the masses of students in the so-called "bottom third"?

The administrative answers reflected the "character through accommodation" theme we consider characteristic of East. They seemed to be saying that the residential plan could reduce the instability of the commuter tradition, using government loans and grants, mainly on self-amortizing buildings, to establish a new financial and academic base for the future. The administration's direction was set by pragmatic considerations, but they considered their act idealistic pragmatism. They were utilizing the resources they could muster to create what they wanted, and what they wanted was a university with the stability and programs to compete with the other private universities in the area, as well as a school with the flexibility--that quality not so often seen in large, public institutions--to compete in innovations with the state university's innovative programs.

Critics of the residential plan and East-D argued that the heavy indebtedness associated with the creation of a complex university, and the expensiveness of innovations would cause the university, despite the fact that the dorms are self-liquidating, to try to satisfy the high rate of occupancy required for the buildings by giving priority to students able to pay for space there or able to pay for a place in East-D. These emphases might some day jeopardize the institution's long-standing commitment to commuters and divert scholarship money that has gone to them.

There was also the threat of the university becoming overextended financially and academically. Some administrative contacts wondered aloud whether there were sufficient resources to sustain graduate programs, particularly at the Ph.D. level; others saw quantitative expansion competing for limited resources needed for the qualitative improvement of existing programs. East was already in such a bind that "unprofitable courses," i.e., those with an insufficient enrollment, were cut off despite their importance for those enrolled. The free-market approach was being carried, it was said, to dangerous extremes, however understandable it was for university administrators to cast about for new sources of revenue.

The university has shown its innovative capacity by installing wheel-chair lifts and by modifying curbs and other facilities to allow physically handicapped students to study with a minimum of difficulty. Also, East has allowed faculty freedom to organize their classes according to their own best judgment and has provided various institutes and special programs too numerous to mention here. It may be, indeed, that the programmed innovativeness that is supposed to be a feature of the new East will result in programs less daring than those of the past. One member of the university argued that faculty members in East-C have been freer to innovate in their teaching methodology and in course content than faculty in East-D, where certain innovations have been required of all faculty participants.

The research staff was especially interested in these currents and cross-currents of thought and practice bearing on East's philosophy of education and institutional objectives. Related concerns had to do with whether those themes and goals would best be achieved by fidelity to conventional standards of excellence, or by experimentation, or by innovations which might, on the one hand, reconcile differences, or, on the other, bring differing methodologies into the community.

Administrative Perspectives on Educational Objectives

East University publications present several notions about the purposes of higher education for the individual in society and the place of the institutions of higher education in society. The university, according to the literature, is private, nonsectarian, coeducational; it is responsive to "a society becoming increasingly complex and demanding an enormous breadth of spirit and knowledge of all who live meaningfully within it"; it is committed to the liberal arts and thereby it "hopes to implant in its students a respect for reason, spiritual values, creativity, speculation, the abstract, eagerness to evaluate new ideas, and a sense of history and of the excitement of participating in the future.

East officially encourages research and publications among faculty, but it is also stated that the primary function of the faculty is teaching. The students of the university deserve a broad range of programs; these are provided, and students are expected to make use of them. All of these emphases are included in the official literature.

The "dreams and hopes" of East were summarized by their president:

> To teach, to educate, to lead, to illuminate, to provoke, to stimulate, to urge and guide toward far horizons, toward wisdom and understanding, never in the process forgetting to cherish and to care.

These words, presumably, were intended to apply to students rather than to society, or perhaps to students directly and through them to society. The impression was not conveyed by the literature or through conversation with administrators that the university was considered an agent of social change. Rather, East apparently was considered a service-centered institution, reflecting societal values and responding to society's needs. So far as the university's philosophy of education and its institutional objectives were concerned, researchers concluded that there was nothing in the publications or interviews to suggest that East was trying to be innovative or experimental at this level. University officials wanted a complex university with diverse programs, yet are shepherding students in the manner of conventional residential colleges. They wanted to foster faculty research and publications, but emphasize teaching; to have strong departments and professional specializations, yet build this house of many rooms on a liberal arts foundation; to lead, to provoke, to stimulate, but without alienating constituents by variant behavior patterns. It is all familiar, honorable, and well nigh impossible.

The broad objectives of the institution had been shaped, visitors learned, in the president's office, with the help of the board of trustees, and were then brought to administrators for discussion and the preparation of implementational strategies at the meetings of the deans' council (heads of colleges and programs, plus central administrators). There were also numerous informal personal contacts. Project personnel sensed that there was a strong feeling of institutional identity and loyalty among administrators, and a high degree of sophistication at that level regarding purposes and programs.

It was not so evident that the philosophy and broad objectives of the university, particularly in the recent years of growth, had been conveyed to faculty and students. The faculty had experienced considerable personnel turnover, because many faculty followed the common practice of completing advanced degrees at a prestigious university in the area, and, after obtaining degrees, moving away to other universities. Some have stayed, have become knowledgeable about East, and have emerged as the coterie of value transmitters. But that group seemed to be remaining constant while the group of new, less committed faculty became larger. There also have been problems associated with having faculty members commute. The consequence is a certain diminution of participation in campus activities and a probable reduction in knowledge about and loyalty to general institutional objectives.

Some faculty who have stayed with East, received tenure, and may now be in positions of leadership, are actually better fitted for earlier days when the institution was small and its work simple and uncomplicated. They have not kept pace with the growth and evolution of the university, and they neither understand nor help to implement current thinking. Thus, they look to a different era for guidance while East attempts to achieve institutional character appropriate for a time of radical change.

Faculty Data and Student Data

FQ5 Faculty members polled at East were asked:

What proportion of the present faculty do you consider to be seriously concerned, pro or con, with the formal institutional purposes that are intended to give direction and character to your college?

Fourteen percent of the sample of forty-two at East-C replied "Almost all," 31% said "Well over half," and 36% estimated "About half." Nineteen percent checked "One-fourth or so" and no respondent marked "Very few" or "Such things are not the concern of the faculty." These data correspond to that of most schools in the study, except the newer, more innovative colleges. On the other hand, all five of the respondents from East-D marked this item "Almost all."

When attention was directed to the history and traditions of the institution, East did not measure up quite so well. The item read:

FQ9 Do your colleagues express much loyalty to the history and traditions of this institution? (If you are a faculty member at a new college established within the general framework of a university, apply this question to that university.)

The East-C sample gave 31% of its response to the "Less than in similar institutions elsewhere" category. Only one other school in our study showed a larger proportion of faculty marking this option. On the other hand, the 24% who said, "More than in similar institutions elsewhere" provided almost exactly the figure of the composite institutional total (CIT--23%), and the 40% choosing "About as much as faculties in institutions elsewhere" was not significantly below the CIT result of 46%. At East-D, of the five faculty who replied, four persons, or 80%, checked "About as much..." while one, or 20%, thought the faculty expressed more loyalty to the history and traditions of the institution.

Two other questions in the faculty testing instrument were more specific. One dealt with the purposes of education:

FQ11 Which of the following goals of education comes closest to your own view of what education should do? (Rank in order of preference 1-2-3)

The first choice response option selected by 64% of the East-C faculty sample and by the five East-D participants as the most important goal was, "Development of the ability of the person to think and to understand the consequences of his actions." Second choice at East-C was "Development of individual capacity for good judgment," by 31%, and third choice was "Preparation for vocation or profession" (43%). The emphasis of this university on the liberal arts, and the attempt at East to keep academic and professional values in balance, seems confirmed by these data--at least theoretically and in the context of our study.

It is when the personal experience of the respondent is called forth that the strong departmental orientation of the university is shown. Statistics that follow are for East-C:

FQ1 When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the particular task for which you were being considered?

%	
5	Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed, at greater length than the particulars of the job.
17	About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job description.
17	The institutional philosophy and educational purposes were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.
48	The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would relate thereto.
14	No response.

Only three institutions in the study, all major state university campuses, gave a higher percentage response to the priority of departments. The "No response" rate at East-C on this item was also high. These data match the emphasis some administrators, in the interviews, put on departmental autonomy at East and indicate to us the presence of a professionally oriented faculty.

Two other items from the faculty questionnaire bear on the issue of the role of the institution of higher learning in society. Respondents were asked to give their personal views on two statements:

FQ15

> Colleges and universities, as institutions, must assume a larger, more important role in setting the goals and programs of our society.
>
> Course work should be more relevant to the social and political realities in the world outside the campus.

Following are the East-C, East-D, and CIT responses on the first statement:

%

	Strongly agree	Agree	Can't say	Disagree	Strongly disagree
East-C (N=42)	26	38	10	21	0
East-D (N=5)	40	60	0	0	0
CIT (N=577)	27	44	8	15	2

And for the second statement:

East-C	19	26	12	36	7
East-D	20	0	60	0	0
CIT	12	36	13	28	3

Both statements were to be treated, not in the context of current practices at the respondent's school, but from the respondent's perspective on higher education generally. East people were mildly on the side of greater university influence in societal goal setting and more social relevance for courses, but they were not radical. It seems to us that these data show close congruence between faculty views on these matters, the position the university has taken in its literature, and that represented by administrators. East's faculty and administration appear unlikely to join the adversary culture.

Turning now to student data, as one way of learning what the entering freshman's perception of East's philosophy and programs were the student questionnaire asked how much the respondent knew about the SQ46 "General philosophy of the college." Nineteen percent of the East-C freshmen in the sample said they "Know a lot about it," while the students entering East-D who were this confident totalled 36%. Those who said they "Know a little about it" came to 69% at East-C and 55% at East-D. Ten percent at East-C said they "Don't know anything about it," while this view was taken by 9% of entering students at East-D. These data, when compared with the CIT, show that East-C is rather low on the "Know a lot" end of the scale and high on the "Don't know anything" end. The 10% of students claiming "Don't know anything about it" was second highest among project schools. However, considering the preponderance of commuting students and lack of tradition in the university, we conclude that East has made its philosophy fairly well known to entering freshmen.

SQ44 The student questionnaire item, "Do you see this college as having some special quality that distinguishes it from other colleges and universities?" brought an affirmative response from freshmen in eight of the eleven institutions for which we have project data. East-C students were in the minority group answering in the negative. Thirty-nine percent of them said that "It has a special distinguishing quality," but 59% said it is "Not greatly different from other colleges." A dramatic difference in student perception was evidenced at East-D where 82% thought their college had a special quality while only 18% answered negatively. The innovative nature of East-D's curriculum had, obviously, been communicated to most entering freshmen.

When East-C students were asked to name desirable features in an institution of higher learning, their responses supported conventional and traditional educational forms. An ideal college would be "traditional SQ47 in most respects," they said. The proportion choosing this option (73%) was the second highest among the schools for which data were available. The remaining 24% of the East-C students favored a college which was "experimental in most respects." Meanwhile, at East-D, 24% said "traditional" and 74% said "experimental," exactly the reverse. Apparently, the students have sorted themselves into the appropriate colleges in spite of their denial of knowledge about the general philosophy of either school.

Related to the "traditional" orientation of East-C freshmen is the SQ2 tendency of these students to be professionally or vocationally inclined. When asked, "Which of the following objectives do you hope to gain in college?" the most important objective listed by East-C students was "To master certain techniques applicable to my vocation or field of special interest" (45%). In second place was "To acquire and use the skills and habits involved in critical and constructive thinking" (26%), and this was followed by, "To develop a broad, general outlook and familiarity with a variety of subjects" (16%). The responses of the students in the avowedly innovative college (East-D) on the same question were as follows: vocational orientation 30%, critical thinking 31%, broad outlook 28%.

SQ45 On another question, one having to do with the student's reasons for selecting the institution with which he was associated, the three reasons most commonly called "Important" were the "location" of the college (55%), its "general academic reputation" (52%), and "career reasons"--that is, the school was seen as important for getting a good job, getting into graduate or professional school (46%). The attention of these students to "location" was high compared to almost all other samples (one, at an ocean front location, went higher), while the percentage of respondents considering "general academic reputation" important was comparatively low. The number of students who regarded "career reasons" as important in their selection of East-C was slightly above average. These data reflect the practical-vocational-professional concerns of East-C students.

What is more surprising and a point that may be encouraging to many in the university is the considerable interest at East in values usually associated with the liberal arts. The literature and administrators there had said that the liberal arts were basic to all else, and the entering freshmen, on the evidence of questionnaire data, were favorably inclined toward the sort of broad, general program usually associated with the introductory phase of a liberal arts program. In speculating about the characteristics of an ideal college, students

SQ47 stated a preference for "Emphasis on a broad, general program of learning" rather than "Emphasis on a specialized area of learning" (69% vs. 29% at East-C and 70% vs. 28% at East-D). It should also be pointed out, however, that the proportion favoring the broad program was lower at East than at all but one of the project schools.

One other bit of data that may be relevant to how East freshmen define the purposes of higher education comes from a question in which SQ40 respondents are asked, "Did anyone try to discourage you from attending this school?" If students answered affirmatively, they were then given a list of reasons from which they were to select those appropriate to their situation. At East-C, 30% answered "Yes," and 69% answered "No." The latter figure is the highest for this study and means, perhaps, that parents and friends were generally happy to see these youth get into college, into an available college providing training for occupations and citizenship. Among those respondents stating that their decision had been challenged, the largest numbers stated that the two chief arguments they heard against East were: "Too expensive" (9%) and SQ40 "Academic standards not high enough" (9%).

Another conclusion that can be drawn from some of the foregoing student data is that the comparatively high concern of East-C freshmen for career matters did not carry the corollary of disinterest toward innovation and experimentation. Their interest in these matters was less strong, to be sure, than in most other colleges of our institutional sample but yet strong enough to indicate potential support in the student body for innovative programs.

It is necessary to distinguish, however, between the student responses dealing with the realities of the college as seen by them and their responses concerning educational ideals. East-C students did not give high priority to the opportunity to participate in experimental

SQ45 educational programs; only 3% marked this option as important in their selection of East-C. Likewise only 23% said that the opportunity to pursue an individualized academic program was important as a selection factor. Many other things ranked higher. Yet, when asked how they felt about competing with other students for grades and recognition, East-C respondents showed more dislike for such competition than was true in most other project schools and respondents from East-D showed the highest percentage "dislike" for grade competition to be found in the total

SQ30 institutional sample. The results follow:

	East-C (%)	East-D (%)
I very much dislike it and prefer to avoid it	18	28
I dislike it somewhat	26	22
I have neutral feelings about this	27	16
I like it somewhat	23	22
I like it very much	5	10

SQ47 In the question dealing with the characteristics of an ideal college, students were asked whether they favored a situation in which there was "Much competitiveness for grades and recognition" or one with "Little competitiveness for grades and recognition." Sixty-six percent at East-C favored "Little competition" while 31% liked competition. At East-D the figures on the same item were 68% and 31%. It seems fair to draw the implication that a sizable percentage of entering freshmen

at East would be open to suggestions about alternative grading arrangements. However, one form of innovation in this connection was explicitly rejected by the students. They did not favor pass/fail grading and they specified, in fact, that their ideal college would do better to use letter grades (A-F): pass/fail--22%, letter grades--76% for East-C, and pass/fail--28% and letter grades--62% for East-D respondents.

Other specific types of innovation fared better. "Mostly group discussion classes" were preferred to "Mostly lecture classes" (73% to 24% East-C, 76% to 24% East-D); "Students selected mostly on personal qualities" nearly balanced at East-C with "Students selected mostly on grades and admission scores" (49% to 48%) and emphasis on independent study was clearly favored over little such emphasis (72% to 25%). The balance in favor of the innovative options increased at East-D with 52% favoring selection by "personal qualities" and 84% favoring "independent study."

On the sticky question of widening the base of the authority structure of the university, East-C freshmen were on the side of increased involvement for students. The question read: "Should students participate significantly in the content and organization of courses, academic policy decisions, and matters of this sort? About 44% said "Yes," 16% "No," 34% "Maybe," and 5% chose "Don't know." East-D students carried the emphasis a bit further: 49% "Yes," 12% "No," 32% "Maybe," 6% "Don't know."

Another item dealt with related possibilities, and data for East-C and East-D are given here along with the statements:

SQ58	East-C	East-D
Students should be given very great freedom in choosing their subjects of study and in choosing their own areas of interest within those subjects.	55%	48%
There is a body of knowledge to be learned, and the faculty is more competent than the student to direct the student's course of study, through required courses, prerequisites, and the like.	45%	52%

The East-D responses reflect in all probability the prescribed curriculum the college had at the time of the study. The majority of freshmen in the East-C freshman class seem to have taken a fairly radical posture on the question of student participation in governance and greater student involvement in the determination of their academic programs. Compared with certain other student samples in the study they do not stand out as staunch advocates of change but, given their social backgrounds and academic interests, these results are noteworthy.

The faculty respondents at East-C indicated that they were not
inclined to increase student participation in the formulation and
FQ4 implementation of academic policies. In fact, the 74% answering "No"
to a question on this subject constituted the largest percentage in
all faculty samples in the project to stand against further student
involvement. However, four of the five members of the East-D faculty
answered "Yes" to the notion of greater student involvement.

The position of the East-G faculty sample on what has been called the conventional standard of institutional excellence may be seen in their responses to the items of the following table:

FQ12

	Personal View (%)						View of Others (%)					
	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important		Very important		Somewhat important		Not important	
	East-C	CIT	East-C	CIT	East-C	CIT	East-C	CIT	East-C	CIT	East-C	CIT
Teaching in the area of academic specialization	83	83	14	15	0	1	88	72	10	17	0	2
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	12	26	67	55	21	17	10	23	71	60	17	8
Research and writing	57	66	40	27	2	5	26	48	64	36	5	6

It is evident from this table, particularly when the comparison with the CIT is noted, that faculty at East-C conform rather closely to the values of colleagues elsewhere on these matters of professional concern.

FQ2 Other features of academic life usually associated with a professional orientation were listed in another question on the faculty questionnaire. Respondents, as before, were asked to give their personal views and to estimate the attitudes of other faculty:

-continued-

	Personal View (%)			View of Others (%)		
	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
Opportunity for professional advancement	60	29	12	60	36	2
Availability of research money and facilities	31	50	19	17	67	14
Freedom in organizing courses, setting schedules, etc.	83	10	5	60	31	5
Opportunity to influence departmental policies	64	31	5	45	45	5

The above emphases should not be associated exclusively with a professionally oriented faculty; the last two matters, for example, may well be concerns of reform-minded professors. However, all four matters in the list just given as well as the three in the earlier list are subjects of great importance for faculties everywhere who think in terms of guild, department, and professionalism.

East-D faculty are less committed to the values and activities just discussed. Perhaps this reflects a "reality factor"--the program in which they work is more cross-disciplinary, innovative, professionally aberrant. Listing the "personal view" data shows these differences:

-continued-

FQ12,2

	East-D Personal Views (%)		
	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
Teaching in the area of specialization	60	40	0
Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	20	60	20
Research and writing	0	80	0
Opportunity for professional advancement	40	40	20
Availability of research money and facilities	40	40	20
Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.	80	20	0
Opportunity to influence departmental policies	100	0	0

The emphasis in the East-C faculty on conventional standards is consistent with the assumptions, values, and goals for the general university that had emerged from administrative interviews. Not only did administrators state that the East faculty worked best within the regular disciplines and the conventional departmental structure, but they said also that, excepting East-D--where faculty were working across departmental lines effectively and without acrimony--there was no desire to reduce the strength of the departments. They said that departments still provided the best gathering places for energy and ideas because at East-C, below the level of administration, the dispersal of people and the diversity of interests made it nearly impossible to establish a general sense of community.

Faculty advancement at East has been determined by success in four areas--teaching, service on campus, community service, and professional life. Faculty state their accomplishments in these areas, the department head makes comments on the faculty member's performance, and these are given to faculty to read and sign. Then the department chairman adds his recommendations for salary and rank, and these too are shown to the faculty member. Here again, in the area of rewards and sanctions, in the way they are determined and reported, the professional and departmental emphases emerge.

Chief administrators expressed eagerness to have faculty become more active in policy formulation and academic leadership. They acknowledged that, to date, the initiatives for change in the university had come mainly from administration, especially for any broad, holistic innovations. Although administrators thought the "initiatives for change" came from administrators, the faculty thought initiatives came from the faculty or from the faculty in conjunction with the administration, as the following data reveal:

FQ8

	East-C (%)	East-D (%)
Faculty	31	40
Administrators	17	20
Students	0	0
Faculty and Administrators	40	20
Faculty and Students	0	20

It should be noted, in passing, that some students felt that faculty may have ideas on general educational policy decisions but that, because they are based in the departments and have only limited experiences beyond those borders, and because faculty prefer to avoid trouble and do not wish to get involved in political complications, they defer to administrators.

As for student participation in governance, the prevailing view among administrators was that the students had ample ways by which to make their views known and that, while the lines of communication would be kept open, the administration was not ready (1966-67) to add students as voting members on academic policy bodies. It was also mentioned that, compared to most universities, students at East receive much attention from faculty in the various departments of the university and that there was opportunity for student ideas on curriculum to be heard at that level. Researchers found difficulty in accepting this contention because certain things about East seemed to make this communication unlikely: Its high student-faculty ratio; its largely commuting students body; its transient faculty, with many living some distance from the campus; its lack of provision for informal encounters among students and faculty (the new faculty club seems to be a move away from such contacts). These and other conditions were seen by the visitors to be inhibitors of substantive contacts between students and faculty.

The formal arrangement for student participation at the time of the study was the student affairs committee (where, in fact, students outnumbered administrators). From there, matters could be referred to the faculty academic senate. Again and again administrators said that, as with faculty, they wished for more student interest and involvement and they lamented the inactivity of students and their docility about academic considerations.

Faculty ideas about the institution's governance structure and their own leadership role came out in several questionnaire items. "Who FQ18 would you say," one question read, "has the most powerful voice in determining the educational policies, i.e., the general objectives rather than the particulars of a given program, in your college?" East-C faculty considered that the greatest influence was exerted by the president (38%), with the dean and the "general faculty" tieing for second place (17% each). Two of the faculty at East-D designated the dean as the leader in determining policy matters there, while the other three votes were scattered. In only one other institution in the study did a larger percentage of faculty name the president as having "the most powerful voice" in policy formulation.

Another item in the faculty questionnaire invited respondents to indicate their attitude toward the claim of Robert Hutchins that

FQ3

> The duty of the faculty is to formulate the purposes and programs of the university. The duty of the regents [trustees] is to interpret and defend them.

A very high percentage of individuals at East agreed (88% at East-C and 100% at East-D). The CIT agreement on this question was 80%. While support for the Hutchins statement was theoretical and while the quotation dealt with faculty-trustee relationships, it seems likely that the stated desire of East administrators to have greater academic policy leadership from faculty is a desire shared by the faculty. Why they have not actually been involved in that which everyone seems to want is a question best left to the East community.

FQ2 Most East-C faculty respondents deemed an "enlightened, skillful administration" "Very important" (74%) for the academic life while about 26% considered it "Somewhat important." East-D emphasized this level of administration even more strongly (4 to 1). When representing faculty colleagues, support for administration was less emphatic, but still definite: 60% "Very important" and 38% "Somewhat important" for East-C, 60% "Very important" and 40% "Somewhat important" at East-D.

East's administrators said that they believed the future of their institution would be characterized by the two themes of quality and innovation. They thought that their community had both the resources and the will for accomplishments in these areas. Following are data from certain items in the faculty and student questionnaires that seem relevant to any such intentions.

FQ15 When faculty respondents were asked to give their personal views on this statement:

> Radical technological changes in our society necessitate radical changes in the educational experiences offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different.

the distribution of responses at East-C and East-D went as follows:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Can't say	Disagree	Strongly disagree
East-C (%)	12	48	7	21	7
East-D (%)	0	60	20	20	0

The generally favorable attitude toward change which is shown in these data may not seem so encouraging to advocates of change when it is known that the "Strongly agree" faction at East-C was in a virtual tie for last place among the samples in the study. While, to be sure, there was not a great deal of difference among samples on this item, it is significant that East stands low although it is a declared exponent of innovation and experimentation.

FQ19 Another questionnaire item shows the conservatism of the East-C faculty sample:

> Please scale your faculty colleagues, as personal observation allows, on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of your college by checking one response for each item:

	East-C (%)			
	Most	About half	Some	Very few
Seem to favor "change for change's sake"	0	2	33	62
Willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures	14	29	48	10
Not hostile to innovation, but unwilling to get involved personally	21	36	40	2
Hold to the principle that "nothing new must be tried for the first time"	0	2	21	74
Believe that "if it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change"	2	17	26	52

From the perspective of East's commitment to change, the crucial positive response item in the above table is "Willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures," and the crucial negative item is the third one, where abstract permissiveness toward innovation is coupled with personal unwillingness to get involved. On both these items East-C faculty respondents failed to match the composite institutional totals (CIT), that is, there were smaller percentages in the combined "Most" and "About half" columns on the personal involvement statement and larger percentages for the personal unwillingness columns.

FQ2 When faculty participants indicated the importance for themselves and for their colleagues of "An opportunity for experimentation and innovation," East-D faculty unanimously declared it to be "Very important" when speaking personally, and their representation of colleagues changed the result only slightly--"Very important" (80%) and "Somewhat important" (20%). The East-C faculty sample, however, just about matched the CIT when speaking for themselves but, again, in this they ran well behind most of the avowedly innovative institutions in the total study. Comparison with the CIT is given below:

	Personal View (%)		
	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
East-C	67	26	7
CIT	66	28	4

When the East-C sample turned to the importance of an opportunity for experimentation and innovation in the professional lives of colleagues, the disparity between self-perception and view of others was marked. The opportunity for innovation and experimentation was "Very important" to other faculty, said 33% of our respondents, about half (55%) thought that such an opportunity was "Somewhat important" to colleagues, and four respondents (10%) said these matters were "Not important" to their peers. This drop from the 67% who indicated "Very important" with reference to self to 33% when thinking of others, while noteworthy, is about the same as the general institutional picture where the drop in CIT scores for this item was from 66% to 35%.

The strength of the departmental orientation at East-C, and the

lack of enthusiasm for a particular form of innovation were indicated
FQ12 when faculty participants were asked to state the importance of cross-disciplinary teaching for themselves and their colleagues. About 17% said it was personally very important to them, but only 2% (one person) saw it as very important for other faculty. Fifty-two percent regarded cross-disciplinary teaching as somewhat important to them, and 55% saw it that same way for others on the faculty. This innovation was deemed not important by 26% of the respondents when they referred to themselves, and 36% felt that it was not important for colleagues. In the "Very important" category, East-C people lagged behind the CIT (self--27%; others--10%). Cross-disciplinary teaching was more important to respondents from East-D. There, 60% saw it as "Very important" for both "self" and "others."

The record was much the same regarding another practice that, given current faculty values, must be seen as an innovation--tutorials and other one-to-one student-faculty learning arrangements. East-C results and the CIT follow:

FQ12

	Personal View (%)			View of Others (%)		
	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
East-C	31	50	19	10	57	31
CIT	42	41	14	15	53	18

Again, in the pivotal "Very important" category, East-C comes up short from the perspective of innovative attitudes. The percentage of persons who regarded tutorials as very important to them personally was the lowest in the study. Again, in the smaller, innovative college, East-D, there was considerably greater interest in tutorials--80% declaring such to be "Very important" personally.

Not all the data from East-C mark faculty there as being as conservative as faculty in institutions where no claim to innovation is made. On one item, East-C faculty came out rather strongly in support of a statement which blamed faculties for the failure of innovation at the undergraduate level. The East-C response pattern was either an exercise in mea culpa or an expression of dissatisfaction with a situation that frustrates change. The statement was by David Riesman:

FQ10

> In the United States...the major tide seems to be running heavily against innovation at the undergraduate level, less because of student conservatism, although this is a factor, than because faculty members are in such demand that they can set their own terms. Generally the terms include a reduction of hours spent with undergraduates, whether in the classroom or as advisers, and an unremitting effort preferably to teach postgraduate students and, failing that, to teach only advanced undergraduates--and to teach these in turn as if they were being prepared for graduate work.

Those expressing agreement with the point of the quotation totalled 71% in the East-C sample. About 21% said they disagreed with the point of the quote. East ranks high among the institutions of the study in giving an affirmative answer here (CIT showed 60% agreeing and 32% disagreeing). These faculty members seem able to acknowledge that they frustrate innovation, even while continuing to oppose innovative measures.

The matter of assigning letter grades, units of credit, and having rigid course requirements is an area in which, according to data, the East faculty seem amenable to change. Here is a place for those interested in innovation to begin work with some hope of success. Respondents were asked to apply the following statement to their institution:

FQ14 There should be less emphasis on grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements.

One-third of the sample of faculty from East-C said they "Strongly agree," while a somewhat larger group (38%) said they could "Agree." On the other side, 19% stated that they must "Disagree," and one person (2%) put down "Strongly disagree." About 10% were in the "Can't say" bracket. The total of 69% who stated some measure of agreement provides a clue to the existence of a broad base of support at East for reforms in these areas. The extent of support here, in a faculty that appears to be traditional in most respects, may indicate that the policy of the college in these matters has been quite conservative.

One other questionnaire item brought out data which suggest that the openness of the faculty to reform is not limited to the academic matters specified previously. The item on which the respondent was to give his personal view read:

FQ15 Too much emphasis is presently being placed on innovation and experimentation in higher education. Existing standards and arrangements are sound, and these should be achieved and utilized--not replaced.

The majority of the East-C sample took a stand against the statement: 43% disagreed, while another 17% said they strongly disagreed. Meanwhile, the combined total for those marking "Agree" and "Strongly agree" came to 17%. Those marking "Can't say" were 19%. Yet, again it must be pointed out that this manifestation of support for innovation does not set East's faculty apart from the attitudes and emphases of faculties elsewhere. The CIT on this item ran: "Strongly agree," 3%; "Agree," 17%; "Can't say," 12%; "Disagree," 48%; and "Strongly disagree," 17%.

Despite some interest in innovation, the conclusion drawn from these data is that East-C is in the mainstream of the values, forms, and styles of American academics. This may be precisely where the faculty of East-C wants to be. They may want the innovative thrust of the university confined to East-D or to other special, perhaps peripheral, components of the university. Thus, in their view, the comment about the university not standing out as an innovative institution may lose force in that it is seen by them to be invalid to expect innovation from a unit of the university that is not and does not aspire to be innovative. However, from our viewpoint the case stands, because the university, qua university, has declared itself to be committed to experimentation, innovation, and change.

East University was, in fact, a conundrum to project personnel. Evidence of creative stirrings was everywhere, yet the values dominant at all levels of the programs seemed essentially conventional. The ambiguities or ambivalence of the situation was epitomized at the innovative college, East-D. The curriculum there featured a balance between cross-disciplinary integrative courses and concentration in a particular discipline. The faculty were selected, the literature said, for their "professional knowledge in a specific field of study" and, equally, for their capacity to relate their specific field of knowledge to other fields under investigation. Faculty were to maintain the professional respect of university colleagues, establish personal contacts with students, and yet to emphasize the teaching role. Any student who could be admitted to East without being on academic probation was eligible for East-D. That community was not to be regarded as an intellectual elite and could have no special privileges or arrangements in regard to housing and general university procedures. Yet they worked a longer school day and had a curriculum with an unusual course structure, with lectures and small group meetings and discussions where topics were selected by students. East-D was to be in a "small intellectual community" with maximum opportunity for "intellectual stimulation and rapport." Students there were to receive a humanistic undergraduate curriculum whereby "a discipline is presented not only as a body of knowledge and methods, but is examined in terms of its human significance." Students should be able to continue their studies in graduate or professional school, but the college was not going to compromise its aims to meet certain specialized demands. The General Program of the college was not to substitute for the Concentration Program but was "to provide the student with further perspectives in his own discipline; while making available to him modes of thought from disciplines other than his own."

Again and again, the risk is taken and then withdrawn, taken but qualified, taken and compromised. East-D, it seemed, wanted to be different without being special. This fearfulness about both the character and consequences of substantive change came through in the interviews and discussions about the innovative college. It was said that the students received no privileges, but it was also said that they got more personal attention from faculty and were treated with more tolerance and patience than would be true in the academic departments of East-C. The innovative college was not to be elitist, yet efforts were being made during the year of the study to bring into East-D students from residential prep schools rather than from public high schools and home residency. The college would not be separate in ethos and style, it was said, yet there appeared to be little contact between East-D students and faculty and people elsewhere in the university. The faculty at East-D was on a par with faculty at East-C, yet visitors also heard that faculty worked harder at East-D and that man for man they were better. East-D was to be innovative, yet through some conversations it seemed that the students in the innovative college were envious, particularly regarding social activities of those in conventional East-C, while some students in East-C did not see East-D as truly innovative except at the point of bringing students and faculty together in informal encounters.

New programs in colleges and universities always experience the difficulties of misunderstanding and partial knowledge, as well as the criticism of those whose vested interests are challenged by the new enterprise. These things are not surprising. But what was difficult to accept was the uncertain character of an effort at East-D that had great potential for character. While people elsewhere in the university did not seem to know what those at East-D were trying to become, those at East-D did not seem certain about wanting to become what they said they would be.

Over against this tendency to ambivalence among faculty and administrators at East concerning the character of East-D, data on the expectations of the students entering that college suggest that they had rather uncompromising expectations on at least three matters.

SQ45 Compared to other student samples in this study, East-D freshmen ranked first in the percentage (66%) declaring that the opportunity to participate in an experimental educational program was important to them in choosing their college. They were also the highest for the study when indicating that an opportunity to pursue an individualized academic program was important (64%) in their selection of East-D. The third consideration of importance was the desire of 65% of the East-D sample of students for a "closely-knit college community." The students at East-D apparently knew what they wanted even though their elders were uncertain.

Despite the potential for divisiveness inherent in conditions just discussed, the prospects for community at East seemed as good as in more secluded, residential, cohesive institutions. When asked FQ2 about the importance of "A sense of community," nearly half (45%) of the East-C faculty respondents said they regarded it as "Very important," while the second largest group (33%) said community was "Somewhat important," and only 19% replied "Not important." Unlike the results on many other items, on this question respondents answered rather similarly for colleagues: "Very important," 36%; "Somewhat important," 48%; and 10%, "Not important."

Later, faculty were asked whether more effort should be made in their institution to bring students and faculty together in FQ14 unstructured, personal encounters. Over three-fourths (76%) of the East-C respondents said that they agreed or strongly agreed with this idea, while 17% disagreed. This was a better showing than the entering students at this college gave when asked how important in

SQ45 selecting East was the notion of a "Closely-knit college community," and a "chance to know students and professors." Some 39% said they were "Important," with another 39% regarding these things as "Somewhat important." About 20% thought them "Not important." These matters were more important to East-D freshmen (65%), but these East respondents did not show the enthusiasm for community that was true in other new and innovative colleges. The 39% in East-C marking these qualities "Important" was second lowest of all entering class samples in the study. Does this mean that freshmen at East realized that commuting students and faculty would have little time to contribute much in these matters?

If community is achieved in the new East it will be distinguished from that of the early days by the diversity of the participants. Homogeneity is giving way to heterogeneity; yet most faculty and students seem united in their concern for community. While, as stated, the entering students did not emphasize community as a factor in selecting East, they did rank a "Closely-knit college community" very
SQ47 high when asked to list the characteristics of an ideal college. Ninety-one percent of the respondents in East-C and 89% in East-D expressed a preference for a close-knit community.

The sense of community which exists at East is based, said certain of the participating administrators, on two things--first, the university's struggle for survival and, second, the close student-faculty relationships that have developed in many departments. What, we ask, will produce the spirit of community at East in the future? The answer to that question, we feel, cannot now be known because the direction and thrust of the university, that which gives character or distinctiveness to the place--whether philosophy and purposes, conventional criteria of excellence, or forms of innovation and experimentation--are not yet manifest.

CHAPTER VIII

WEST UNIVERSITY

Current publications of West University often carry one of two banners--"[The state's] first chartered institution of higher learning" or "First with today's cluster college concept." The first word and the last word--that is the image West seeks.

Chartered in the mid-nineteenth century and intended by the founders to be "an institution of the grade of a university," West has been, in fact, a little of almost everything on its way to becoming a university. There have been four name changes and three primary locations in two different cities with recent expansion into two additional cities. West was chartered as a university, offering separate programs for men and women, but it soon moved toward becoming a college, divesting itself of an early medical program, for example. At another period the college added several graduate and professional programs; still later the curriculum was limited to upper division work and graduate courses, leaving lower division work to a publicly-funded community college. In recent years, again a university, West has added professional schools and graduate programs (including two Ph.D. programs) and new undergraduate colleges. In the present era of great change, West ought to prosper, for it has always been characterized by change. Certainly this state's first chartered institution of higher learning has experienced most of what has happened singly or in small doses to other colleges and universities in the state.

The cluster college concept at West University provides a good example of the style of operation that has typified the history of this university. By 1960, West had three urgent problems. It needed, first, to broaden its base of financial support. The university's operating budget had to be raised mainly from tuition income and the efforts of the president and development office staff because of its very limited endowment, marginal financial assistance from a Protestant denomination, a middle class alumni which had not developed a tradition of support for the university, and a board of trustees whose financial contributions, with some exceptions, had been token. The cluster college idea, it was thought, would attract wealthy benefactors (whose names could be assigned, not to a building or an academic chair, but to a whole college) as well as foundation support for innovative efforts and support from an extended clientele as a diversity of colleges came into being.

There was need, second, to establish the university's identity. Friendly, easygoing West College, well known throughout the region for its football teams and conservatory of music, had again become West University. In a state with extensive public educational services (the university, state colleges, and junior colleges) there was a question about the future of private higher education--not only survival but also significance--and especially about West's place in the sun. Graduate and professional programs would, of course, be added as soon as possible. But they were expensive. Library and laboratory resources were very limited. The setting was not especially attractive for scholars and their research--better than some places, worse than many. The cluster college concept seemed a viable mechanism for the achievement of institutional identity: Funds for programs of the new colleges should become available from benefactors; facilities could be built with government money; programs in the humanities and social sciences would not be too expensive; students and parents might be attracted to an innovative approach to liberal education. (The last assumption was not borne out in reality. It was assumed that getting students would be no problem, whereas, in fact, all three of the cluster colleges now established have been to date undersubscribed.)

Above all, in establishing the institution's identity, the concept of the "West family" with its emphasis on the advantages of small size and the spirit of community would be enhanced by the federated colleges at the same time the university was expanding. West would, as the president was wont to say, grow larger by getting smaller. The university would be first with today's cluster college concept, thereby achieving identity for the university even while the new colleges were establishing their identity within West's community.

The idea of federated colleges was not new in 1960 when West's administration began planning for, as was then said, "fifteen colleges in fifteen years." The Atlanta complex of colleges and the Claremont colleges had been established long before. Of course, these other places were essentially autonomous institutions with only loose and limited working relationships between them. But neither was the idea of experimental subunits within a university new at that time. In the East, Wesleyan University had already launched its subject area specialization colleges. In the West, in 1957, Nevitt Sanford proposed a one-year experimental liberal arts program for the University of California and, in the next year, he proposed that the University of California establish "within its own body" a two-year experimental liberal arts college. In 1958-59, the President of the University of California began planning for a new campus to be based on semi-autonomous undergraduate colleges. What West did, to the credit of their president, was to take ideas then in the air and quickly move to apply and implement them. This illustrates how a private, comparatively small university can put into motion within two years what it takes five years to launch in a large, complex state university.

The first college, it was decided by West's president and academic vice president, would be an innovative, liberal arts college with an enrollment of 250. The president decreed this size for all cluster colleges. The figure was determined not on the basis of a feasibility-statistical study, or on the basis of faculty thinking at West about the ideal size for the best learning environment, but as a result of several trips by chief administrators to Oxford and Cambridge where they were told that the glories of the British Oxbridge system were achieved when the college enrollments were about 250.

Particular innovations that might be incorporated in the first cluster college, according to the academic vice president's planning, included a prescribed four-year curriculum featuring a balanced distribution of work for all students in the three classical divisions of the liberal arts--humanities, social sciences, natural sciences. A special feature of the curriculum was to be a science program as an integrated sequence, moving from physics to chemistry and finally biology. The total program was to be of high academic quality, more intensive and inclusive than customary liberal arts arrangements. The college was to set the academic pace for West.

Living facilities for the college would be new, separate (although on the same campus), and complete. The Oxbridge influence was again manifest in the emphasis on served meals as an expression of gracious living and with various physical stylistic touches to suggest the school's historic lineage.

The academic innovations proposed by the first planners (the president, the academic vice president, and the new school's provost, working occasionally with other university administrators as special considerations arose) assumed an understanding of what was meant by the liberal arts ideal as well as confidence as to the adequacy of that ideal. The planning committee was determined to recreate a lost but cherished liberal arts ethos. The provost was especially active in planning an organization for the first college that seems, from the perspective of current thinking, to have been separatist-elitist. Subject matter specialization was played down, broad course distribution played up (with some concern for the integration of established fields of learning but with little attention given to the means for their integration). The concept of community was seen as crucial to all else--students and faculty would learn together while administration was to be kept to a minimum. One of the virtues of the cluster college idea, everyone thought, was the chance it gave innovators to leave many routine matters, such as fundraising and admissions, to central administration. What was not so clearly seen at the outset was that the college would be, finally, at the mercy of university administrators. They held the purse-strings; the college proceeded at their pleasure. So long as central administrators were friendly to innovation, the position of the new college would be secure, but beyond the spirit of goodwill and the support of key administrators there was no security.

The leader upon which all else depended in the formative period was the university's president. His predecessor, West's president from 1919 to 1946, had controlled every facet of the institution's life. The former president had claimed to be uninterested in educational philosophy. He had allowed faculty to develop departmental identity but preferred not to involve them in institutional policy formulation. He had kept the faculty dispersed and individually related to himself. The leadership of the current president since his appointment in 1947 has been no less dominant, but it has been more discreet. He has kept certain important decisions to himself, mostly financial ones, but has freely delegated others. West in recent years has been run by an oligarchy with a democratic front. Yet it may well have been precisely because of this limited distribution of power that the cluster college concept could be established there. The president had long and openly insisted that faculties are both conservative and slow. He believed, therefore, that the planning for the university's expansion and improvement must be kept in the hands of an administrative coterie. This he has arranged and it may have enabled the first three colleges to get underway. West-F opened in 1962; the second cluster college, a program for training Latin American specialists, with most of the student body from South American countries and with most lectures and discussions in Spanish, was opened in 1963; and, since this research study began, the third cluster college was created (1967) with a liberal arts program featuring a sophomore year in India and a non-Western emphasis in the curriculum. The president has fallen behind that schedule set in the first burst of enthusiasm--fifteen colleges in fifteen years--but he moved rapidly enough to get the cluster college concept into operation ahead of other institutions with similar intentions.

Center researchers were interested in West University as a university undergoing quantitative and qualitative transition, with tight administrative leadership and using cluster colleges as the chief mechanism to effect change. An ancillary staff interest was in the effect of the cluster college administrative structure on the university. No major administrative shift or innovation had been devised for the management of the new configuration. Rather the centralized governance umbrella characteristic of West's past was simply extended to cover new colleges. As the old academic departments had considerable autonomy to set their curriculum schedule, so long as available financial resources were not overextended, the new colleges would have academic autonomy but not fiscal freedom. Central administration would determine general growth patterns and the fiscal formulas to attain them. Cluster colleges would follow line-item budgeting, not program budgeting. Budgets would be ajudicated by central administration in consultation with college provosts.

The obvious advantages in this plan are that duplication of efforts within the university can be avoided and emphases favored by university administrators can be advanced. The disadvantages are that college or program provosts or deans are dealt with separately and hence have no more than a very general knowledge of what is going on financially in programs other than their own. This is a situation in which the head knows what the hands are doing, but the right hand is ignorant of the left. Tension and suspicion can build up among the body's members. Also, because everyone is dependent on central administration, one effect can be the reduction of criticism and the advance of adulation. When resources are very limited, as is certainly true at West, it is understandable that the administration would see centralization as an aid to efficiency. It would be well to note, however, that studies in administration show that centralized government fosters efficiency at the price of creativity.

West-F, the first of the cluster colleges, was chosen for the study along with the core liberal arts unit of the university--here designated West-E. These two units were thought to be representative of developments at the undergraduate level in the university.

Plans for the growth of the university have called for holding West-E fairly stable in size while the expansion of the university's undergraduate population was to be carried out in the cluster colleges. Although not decreed, it was expected that the weight of tradition and the force of habit would make West-E the conventionally oriented liberal arts program while the new colleges sought their identity through various innovations. Each new college, the president had said, would feature its own unique characteristic or program to justify its separate existence in the university and to give the colleges separate personalities and the university diversity in programs.

West-E, however, has had considerable difficulty in establishing its identity since 1962 when the university's new subunits began to open because, as a legacy from the former president, loyalties there developed along departmental lines or according to special programs. West-E seemed to have no more right to the traditions of the university than other units, although some in the college were not sure that they wanted to be saddled with those traditions. Certain younger faculty wanted West-E to establish its identity as an innovative, aggressive member of the university community, not as guardian of conventionality. But many, perhaps most, West-E faculty were content to continue life in their departments pretty much as before. They had not been encouraged to think about broad institutional objectives and educational philosophy--the administration had kept these matters under its control--and faculty meetings of the college were almost entirely perfunctory and ceremonial. Faculty had developed various forms of privatism and were quite content to leave business and general policy to the president.

The West-E faculty did have, however, an understandable interest in its own professional welfare, and consequently there was unrest and disquiet when the cluster college plan was announced. It was not a turbulence caused by administrators taking over prerogatives that many faculties would regard as their own so much as it was a concern for how limited financial resources could be stretched to cover new ventures. Assurances were given that supplementary sources of income would carry the burden. Nevertheless, the West-E faculty was anxious--prophetically, as it worked out. Yet, even issues such as this one were insufficient in the early years of the cluster college development to unite the West-E faculty. When plans for the first two cluster colleges were announced, the typical faculty member shrugged and said that since he had not been consulted he would leave the new programs to their own devices while he got on with his teaching and research. He added that various proposals for innovative programs had been announced at the institution before and that these new ones, like those, would soon be forgotten.

However, as the new colleges became visable entities, leaning heavily on West-E and, of course, striving to establish their presence by reacting vociferously to the habits and attitudes of the sponsoring body, their innovative programs drew much attention. The infant colleges romped like tiger cubs in the presence of a tired, sagging mother. It soon became clear that the success of West-E could not be taken for granted. A new and able dean took up the task of pulling West-E departments into a unified whole. It was time for the mother to cuff the cubs as needed and to reestablish her authority and leadership.

This process was underway at the time of the Institutional Character research project (1966-67). A reaction against the "excessive claims" of the West-F administration and faculty had set in, so that assurances were heard that West-E students and faculty were as good academically as those at West-F and, furthermore, that West-E with its larger size and diversity of programs in the arts and sciences was the more attractive setting within which to teach and learn. The president of the university had stated that one of the benefits of the cluster college notion was the competition that could be expected to develop among units. It was evident by the time of the study that he had accurately predicted what would happen, but it was not certain that what was happening was a benefit to the university.

After a working relationship had been established with administrators in West-E and West-F, as well as with general university administrators,* project samples were established from these two colleges.

The faculty questionnaire was distributed in fall 1966 to forty-nine faculty members in West-E and nineteen at West-F. The forty-nine persons at West-E were a 56% sample of those faculty involved at least in some measure in undergraduate teaching (total faculty being then eighty-seven). Researchers chose a 100% sample of West-F teaching faculty because of the small number on the staff there. Both faculty samples were stratified to get distribution through the ranks and, as a presumed ancillary benefit, a rough age distribution. In the West-E sample, thirty-eight questionnaires were returned. This was 78% of the number invited to take part and a 44% sample of the teaching faculty in that college. West-F faculty returned eighteen questionnaires, a 95% return on the sample and the same percentage of the total faculty.

Student questionnaires designed for the project were given to all 416 entering West-E freshmen in September 1966. West-F freshmen received the same instrument, eighty-eight persons being involved. Students in both entering classes were also given the Omnibus Personality Inventory, and data from the scales of this instrument have been available to project personnel. A small sample of students at both colleges are being studied longitudinally by other Center researchers, and data gathered from these contacts will be presented later in a separate report.

---

*Administrative interviews were conducted by Ernest Palola, research sociologist from the Center; Edyth Short, project research associate; David Kamen, research assistant; and Moffett Hall, bibliographer.

Institutional Objectives

The catalog and other West University publications emphasize two objectives in the university's undergraduate programs. No matter which college, "it is the concern of the university that every graduate be a liberally educated person"; providing a "comprehensive liberal arts education" is the first objective. The means to this end, according to the catalog, is

> . . . a core of subjects leading to the discovery of the fundamental nature of man and the universe, and a general acquaintance with, and appreciation of, man's history and creative achievements, presented in such a way as to develop alert critical thinking, self-expression, and skill in discovering truth.

The second objective emphasized in this university is community or fraternity, that ineffable but unmistakably important factor that gives life to what is frequently referred to around campus as "the West family." West has long had the reputation as a friendly, close-knit community, and one of the most attractive features in the cluster college concept was its promise to personalize and unify the learning experiences of participants, providing a basis for community in the subunits even as the university grew larger and human relationships at that level became more dispersed, formal, and impersonal. Yet the emphasis on community was a university concern in 1966-67. The catalog speaks of privileges and responsibilities:

> The University believes in a friendly mutuality between students and faculty, and in a program of student activities to give opportunity for creative expression and the development of leadership. At the same time, the University holds that privileges are inseparable from responsibilities, and a student who accepts the one is expected to share fully in the other. Thus the student earns the right to continued instruction, residence, work and fellowship.

Of course other emphases figure in the objectives of the institution--preparation for a vocation through academic specialization, graduate programs, and professional schools, and the university's dedication "to Christian principles." Above all, however, West seems committed, as shown in the literature, to undergraduate programs featuring the liberal arts worked out in the setting of an academic community.

These same themes were even more explicit in West-F's publications. The cornerstone of cluster college planning was the confidence that out-of-class supports for the student's learning experiences were more important than in-class activities and that, therefore, facilities, schedules, and everything else must contribute to the creation of a close-knit community serving the needs of the whole person even as the whole person was to become involved in the life of the community. The curriculum of West-F was deliberately structured to provide a balanced program in the liberal arts. Whereas most colleges and universities limited general education to the first year or two of the student's baccalaureate career, moving him quickly into some specialization, the West-F curriculum provided almost three years of liberal arts learning. The college would not be all things to all men but, rather, would seek to do a few things well. The West-F graduate would move on at the fourth year into graduate or professional specialization after a three-year experience in the liberal arts that had its own integrity yet offered at least an introduction to a discipline.

These emphases of West's publications were confirmed in administrative interviews. The primacy of the liberal arts and the necessity for the spirit of community were persistent themes. Neither West-E nor

West-F officials indicated that they had doubts about the essential validity of either emphasis. They, as did the university's central administration, seemed to assume that the values of the Western liberal tradition, of which, after all, the liberal arts are an intellectual and now an institutionalized expression, were the values needed by the students as they entered the technetronic age. The central administration at the time of the study expressed these values through a business ethic and bureaucratic mode of operation. Administrators in the two colleges studied expressed these values in a more academic mode and with emphasis on a consensual operation. Yet they all seemed to be liberals of the sort who are coming under increasingly heavy attack from the new youth movement.

The concern for community also carries value assumptions that, judging by the interviews, went unchallenged by West's administrators. The essential prerequisite for community is goodwill. If goodwill between interest groups is ever lost, the spirit of community is lost. But the basis for goodwill is a body of shared assumptions about man and history and man in the world. Without that, what one man calls benevolence another may call a strategy for enslavement. Shared values of a fundamental sort seem, therefore, to be essential to the achievement of community. It is precisely at this point that trouble may emerge at West. A consequence of the cluster colleges has been to introduce into the university a growing number of youth who do not share the values of the liberal tradition. Their values are sufficiently different to suggest a difference, not in degree, but of kind. Hence, the concept of community is threatened, at least as conceived by the first planners of the cluster colleges. There will surely be more confrontation within community--that could be hoped for--but such differences among interest groups may eventually destroy the very objective which the concept of federated colleges was meant to foster. Community could give way to anarchy, or, fearing anarchy, community could give way to tyranny.

Faculty and Student Perspectives

This research project provided an opportunity to examine faculty and student perspectives in West-E and West-F on the concepts of community and the liberal tradition, concepts which seemed to be major components of the university's philosophy of education and institutional objectives. Additionally, project researchers examined the degree of authority the conventional criteria of institutional excellence exerted with faculty and students as well as their attitudes toward innovation and experimentation in higher education. The special concern in these latter areas of attention was the relative influence of the conventional criteria and innovation in achieving institutional character.

A high percentage of faculty sharing at least a surface manifestation of concern for the ideological or propositional stance of the college would suggest, it was thought, the possibility of openness on their part to substantive involvement in these matters. In the faculty questionnaire, one item read:

FQ5 What proportion of the present faculty do you consider to be seriously concerned, pro or con, with the formal institutional purposes that are intended to give direction and character to your college?

5

West-E (%)		West-F (%)
10	Almost all	72
21	Well over half	28
42	About half	0
13	One-fourth or so	0
10	Very few	0
3	Such things are not the concern of the faculty	0

Another variable bearing on the prospects for faculty involvement in the setting and achievement of general institutional objectives is the individual faculty member's understanding of the importance of a school's educational philosophy, objectives, and goals. If these matters were emphasized more than departmental considerations when negotiations with the individual were being carried out, it may be assumed that institutional leaders--deans, department chairmen, faculty--are concerned for what have been called in the introduction "the integrative values." Also, there is likely to be a greater measure of congruence between the values of the faculty recruit and those of the institution, or at least a willingness on the part of the individual to work within whatever constraints are imposed by institutional values. Such understanding may even suggest a greater willingness to become actively involved in the achievement of those goals that are intended to give institutional character.

The first item in the faculty questionnaire read:

FQ1 When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the task for which you were being considered?

	West-E (%)	West-F (%)
Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed, at greater length than the particulars of the job.	13	78
About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job description.	26	17
The institutional philosophy and educational objectives were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.	29	0
The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would relate thereto.	26	0
No response	5	0

Data for the two preceding questions suggest that faculty members coming into a new and innovative college may be required by the nature of the situation to give more attention to the broad, inclusive objectives of the college than would be true in an older, conventional college. In the older colleges, institutional assumptions, values, and goals are assumed to be known and accepted, or subsumed under departmental emphases, or simply ignored. But, if it is correct that West has always emphasized both the liberal arts and the spirit of community, can these emphases, in a time of expansion and change, be assumed or ignored without risk to the enterprise? Is it not likely, furthermore, that other values will emerge and become dominant--for example, the suprainstitutional norms of conventional excellence? Such a development may be viewed favorably, of course. But if so, it should be pointed out that educators usually consider such values in conflict with values emphasizing community. They also represent a threat of sorts to a conception of the liberal arts which emphasizes the unitary nature of liberal learning.

Entering freshmen were asked to indicate how much they thought they SQ46 knew about the "General philosophy of the college" they had elected to attend. About 61% of the freshman class at West-F professed to know a lot about it, whereas just 17% of the student respondents at West-E felt that they could say as much. Only one entering class in our study showed a lower frequency than did West-E on this item. Similarly, 9% of the West-E students said they knew nothing about the general philosophy of the college at entrance whereas only 1% of the entering frosh at West-F gave this response.

Just as the history of man shows that to know the right is not necessarily to do it, so, surely, to profess to know a school's philosophy is not necessarily to know it or to follow it. Nevertheless, it is fair to surmise that the vitality and character of an institution is more likely to be enhanced by a knowledgeable entering class of students than by those who know little or nothing of these matters.

Two other student questionnaire items seem relevant here. There was evidence that "community" was a part of West's tradition and was stressed at West-E and West-F. The values of entering freshmen at both colleges showed close congruence with this emphasis. A "Closely-knit SQ45 college community. . . a chance to know students and professors" was included in a list of considerations thought to be important to students in selecting their college. Respondents were asked to state whether this item was "Important," "Somewhat important," or "Not important or not applicable." The item on community was marked "Important" by

71% of the West-E freshmen and 82% of the West-F students. Interestingly, only one college in our institutional sample had an entering class disposed to give this matter more importance than West-F's freshmen.

SQ47 The students were also asked to speculate about the characteristics of an ideal college. They were given a list of alternative characteristics and instructed to indicate their personal preferences. One of the line-items on this question was, "Closely-knit college community" or "Relatively impersonal college community." Students everywhere, not surprisingly, favored community in overwhelming numbers, but it is still worth noting that both West-E and West-F ranked high comparatively, with 91% of the respondents at West-E favoring community and 92% being of like mind at West-F.

Another section of the question just mentioned bears on the matter of the emphasis in the university on a broad liberal arts program for undergraduates. Students were asked to state whether they preferred a college emphasizing a broad, general program of learning or one emphasizing specialized areas of learning. West-F freshmen almost unanimously endorsed the broad general program (98%). At West-E, where the departments are the focal point of academic activity and subject matter specialization is emphasized, 76% of the entering freshmen preferred the broad general program. Thus, they seemed to be in harmony with the university's stated philosophy rather than with actual practice at West-E, although the new West-F students were no doubt identifying with the West-F credo as well as their own desires. But whereas the actual academic program at West-F would be consonant with the student's expectation, the entering West-E freshmen would be likely to find some tension between their stated desire, the university's stated objectives, and the preference of many West-E faculty for a program of studies featuring narrow academic specialization.

Evidence that the West-E faculty prefers specialized programs was found in their responses to questions dealing with academic activities and responsibilities in which American faculty participate. Two matters that are prime features of the conventional criteria of excellence are "Teaching in the area of specialization" and "Research and writing." The extent to which faculty identify with these theoretically, that is, without regard to their actual working situation, is a measure of the authority these criteria exert with them. It does not necessarily follow that interest in these activities runs counter to the creation of an effective learning environment for students, although many perceptive educational observers do claim to see a correlation between these faculty emphases and prevailing student complaints about intellectual fragmentation and scholarly withdrawal. It does follow, however, that faculty fidelity to these suprainstitutional norms suggests that, at least as far as those faculty members are concerned, institutional distinctiveness will be identified with criteria that may not square with the educational philosophy and institutional objectives of the particular college or university within which those faculty are located.

The following table shows West-E, West-F and CIT ratings of the importance of "Teaching in the area of specialization." Respondents were asked to give their personal views and the view they felt their colleagues had:

FQ12

	No.	Personal View (%) Very important	Personal View (%) Somewhat important	Personal View (%) Not important	View of Others (%) Very important	View of Others (%) Somewhat important	View of Others (%) Not important
West-E	(38)	95	5	0	71	18	3
West-F	(18)	44	44	6	44	39	0
CIT	(577)	83	15	1	72	17	2

A larger proportion of the faculty at West-E than at any other institution in the study reported teaching in the area of specialization to be "Very important" for themselves. This response probably suggests, on the one hand, the strength of the departmental orientation of this faculty. On the other hand, it may indicate the conscious or unconscious desires of the West-E faculty to identify themselves with mainstream faculty thinking as measured by national standards at a time when at least one of the cluster colleges (West-F) was innovating with cross-disciplinary contacts.

In the second of the indices of faculty commitment to the national standard of excellence--research and writing--the picture is considerably different:

FQ12

	Personal View (%) Very important	Personal View (%) Somewhat important	Personal View (%) Not important	View of Others (%) Very important	View of Others (%) Somewhat important	View of Others (%) Not important
West-E	32	58	10	5	55	32
West-F	50	33	17	22	56	11
CIT	66	27	5	48	36	6

The fact that only two respondents (5%) at West-E considered research and writing to be "Very important" functions for their peers is interesting for two reasons. First, it is the lowest proportion for any institution in the study, and second, it is probably fair to assume on the strength of it that West-E is still tied to an earlier era when the college was known as a place where teaching was everything and research figured not at all. This impression is further supported by the twelve respondents (32%) who thought that research and writing were not important for colleagues. No other institutional sample offered a response this high on this item. But, the 90% of the West-E respondents who reported that research and writing had at least some measure of importance for them personally hints that professional considerations have some influence. The conventional standard of institutional excellence may not be dominant at West-E, but it does have considerable authority.

West-F faculty do not give research and writing the importance indicated by respondents in the total institutional sample, where several major state university campuses are included. However, they do, especially when "self" and "others" data are drawn together for a composite picture, show a greater attention to these activities than do their colleagues at West-E.

There is apparently a mix of the conventional and the innovative in West-F. Faculty members there have been expected to break out of strict disciplinary guild affiliations, and the above table suggests that West-F faculty have modified their thinking on this feature of professionalism. Almost all of them regard teaching in the area of specialization as significant for them, but less than half of the respondents regarded it as "Very important." On the other hand, West-F administrators and faculty from the outset of the life of the college regarded professional publications as a way to advertise the intellectual stance of the college and to help faculty compensate somewhat for the professional risks they were taking in becoming involved with an innovative curriculum. They continue to regard this facet of the conventional criteria as comparatively important.

All the preceding conclusions find further validation from another faculty questionnaire item listing aspects of academic life that are usually important to faculty. Respondents were asked to comment on the importance for themselves and other faculty of the "Availability of research money and facilities."

FQ2	Personal View (%)			View of Others (%)		
	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
West-E	16	66	18	5	45	37
West-F	44	28	28	22	56	11
CIT	51	38	9	51	34	6

These figures do not vary much from those previously offered. Perhaps the most interesting detail is the consistency between the "Personal view" columns on the CIT and the figures in the "View of others" columns. Seldom has this balance been found in the questionnaire items of this research project. There has been, quite often, a considerable difference in the self perception and the view of others. It may be that money "talks" so forcefully that everyone hears. Faculty can be in doubt about what colleagues think concerning educational philosophy and other "esoteric" subjects, but they accurately judge what others think about bread and butter concerns. Thus, if this hypothesis can be accepted, priorities are revealed.

Another item in the same list from which the above table was drawn may show a negative correlation with the development of the authority of conventional criteria at West-E. Faculty were asked to comment on the importance of "An emphasis on teaching" in their own professional life and, again, to venture an opinion about the importance of teaching in the lives of their colleagues. About 82% of the individuals at West-E who answered stated that it was "Very important" for themselves. This is an impressive showing, at least to those who have a high regard for teaching as a legitimate faculty function in contemporary colleges and universities. This figure puts West-E near the top of the participating schools and well above the CIT (61%). West-F measures up equally well--83%. Only one respondent from West-E thought that an emphasis on teaching was "Not important" and no one stated this opinion at West-F.

It is when attention is directed to the "View of others" that what appears to be evidence of change comes to light. In judging their colleagues, 42% of the West-E sample said that an emphasis on teaching was "Very important" to them, 42% thought it was "Somewhat important," and 3% ventured the opinion that their colleagues did not regard teaching as important. Corresponding data from West-F were: 72% "Very important," 17% "Somewhat important," 0% "Not important." What is noteworthy about the West-E response is that only half as many considered an emphasis on teaching to be a very important consideration for colleagues. The CIT figure showed a parallel decline--61% considered it "Very important" for themselves and 32% "Very important" for others. Yet even so, in a university that has traditionally emphasized teaching, this discrepancy in West-E data may suggest that whereas the faculty respondent feels the weight of the formal institutional commitment to teaching sufficiently to influence his personal response, he sees evidence of a developing variance, perhaps for himself as well as others, and he expresses this shift from the university's traditional attitude toward teaching when speaking of his colleagues. The ensuing value vacuum is increasingly being filled, in the opinion of the research team, by an emphasis on research, writing, and other features of a professional orientation.

The conventional standard of institutional excellence, in its student dimension, emphasizes academic considerations and plays down social activities. Thus, a prime consideration in the student's selection of a college or university should be, by conventional criteria, its academic reputation and provision for an individualized academic program. The student samples for project schools show that more than half of the students in every sample except one did emphasize "General academic reputation" as "Important" in the selection of the college they had just entered. The one institution
SQ45 where the proportion fell below the 50% mark was West-E. About 46% marked this response option as important. Approximately 73% of the entering freshmen at West-F regarded the academic reputation of the college as an important consideration in their selection of it. The 25% of the West-E student sample mentioning an individualized academic program as important to them ranked comparatively low (there were three other schools where the students gave slightly less attention to this variable). However, 58% of the West-F respondents thought an individualized academic program important. They ranked highest in this connection.

Neither of the freshman classes at West gave priority to social aspects of college life in their selection of their college. In the West-E
SQ45 sample, 18% thought extracurricular activities important. About 1% were of

this mind at West-F. Living away from home was important for 36% at both
SQ47 West-E and West-F. Students were asked to select characteristics of their
ideal college, including certain social aspects. Responses from the two
colleges at West follow:

	West-E (%)	West-F (%)	West-E (%)	West-F (%)	
Has fraternities and sororities	70	17	28	81	Has no fraternities or sororities
"Big-time" intercollegiate athletics	74	36	24	64	Intercollegiate athletics not emphasized
College with a "party-school" reputation	20	2	74	98	College with a "scholarly" academic reputation

The preceding table indicates that these activities and arrangements, so often associated with a "fun and games" student subculture, are of much more interest to entering freshmen at West-E than to those at West-F.

The close match between student expectations and the emphases of the college into which the student is going emerges as one of the decisive marks of this study. Either the entering student does know quite a bit about the ethos and general characteristics of the college of his choice, and is of the same disposition, or there is a high degree of anticipatory identification by the student with what he senses to be the values of the institution at entrance regardless of his personal preferences.

There is one disquieting implication in the data of the previous table and the statistics immediately preceding. It is that the entering freshmen at West-E do not reflect faculty values, as compared with students at West-F. West-E faculty are, it appears , giving attention to an intensified academic orientation for students as well as a more professional orientation for themselves. Meantime, the new freshmen are still interested in social activities, a less rigorous academic program, and various career orientations.

When asked to indicate the most important objective to be gained in college, student respondents at West-E and West-F marked their questionnaires to show the following proportions:

SQ2	West-E (%) (N=416)	West-F (%) (N=88)
To master certain techniques applicable to my vocation or field of special interest	50	24
To acquire and use the skills and habits involved in critical and constructive thinking	21	49
To attain a satisfactory emotional and social adjustment	5	1
To develop a broad general outlook and familiarity with a variety of subjects	19	26
To acquire knowledge and attitudes basic to a satisfying family life	4	0

Two colleges in the study ran higher on the vocational item than West-E; all others were below it. West-F, with one other college, was least oriented in this direction. Only one college was below West-E on the "critical thinking" item, although two others were in a virtual tie.

This slant in the values of the freshmen at West-E also was shown in that questionnaire item dealing with various considerations affecting the student's selection of his college. About 47% of the West-E respondents SQ45 said that an important consideration for them was "career reasons; that is, important for getting a good job, getting into graduate or professional school." About 28% at West-F gave the same item this emphasis.

Project staff regard these data as showing that the freshman class at West-E in 1966-67 was quite conventional in personal and social values, that they were still responsive to what is now regarded as a traditional collegiate culture. They do not show in any great proportion the theoretical and intellectual orientation of West-F freshmen.

Work has been done by other researchers on the characteristics of students at West-E and West-F, and it is not the place or intention of this report to get into a detailed study of those characteristics. The Student Development component of the Institutional Character research project will present findings in these areas at a later time. However, because some data bear pointedly on the interrelationships between West colleges and the creation of institutional character through an integrative value system, one more table will be presented here:

SQ 27 Which of the following phrases are most descriptive of you during the period you attended high school?
(most descriptive only used here)

	West-E (%)	West-F (%)
In conflict and rebellion against parents	4	0
Opposed to almost all authority	1	0
Introspective	6	17
Critical and reevaluative of accepted values and modes of thinking	10	26
Out for a good time	2	6
Relatively happy and content	47	18
Concerned about social acceptance with others my own age	9	4
Unhappy and alienated from most of those around me	0	0
Independent in my thoughts and actions	18	27

The proportion of West-E youth who remember their high school years as relatively happy and content is not only in rather sharp contrast with the West-F report on this item but it puts the West-E class high on this matter compared to other project schools. Once again evidence is seen that confirms the earlier conclusion on the personal characteristics of these students. West-E frosh are comparatively uncomplicated, "straight" youth, while the West-F students are a different breed of cat. The Omnibus Personality Inventory scales also show the difference between the intellectual orientation of West-F students and that of West-E students, even as other scales on the OPI show the greater emotional balance, judged by conventional terms, attained by students at West-E vis-à-vis West-F.

The religious orientation of students and faculty in these two colleges was shown in the respective questionnaires. Religious attitudes can affect institutional character and, indeed, would seem to have special significance for a university with a long affiliation with a major Protestant denomination. Freshmen at West-E and West-F gave similar responses when asked,

SQ24 Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how do you think of yourself?

	West-E (%)	West-F (%)
I am deeply religious.	14	15
I am moderately religious.	57	48
I am largely indifferent to religion.	20	18
I am basically opposed to religion.	2	10
I have no opinion.	5	9

The only notable difference between the two entering classes is in the higher proportion of West-F students showing opposition to religion. This percentage was, by the way, the highest for any sample in the study. Furthermore, there was no major difference in the religious attitudes of freshmen coming into church-related West University and students entering secular institutions.

As for faculty, the parallel item in the faculty questionnaire went as follows:

FQ16 Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how would you describe yourself in the area of religion?

	West-E (%)	West-F (%)
Deeply religious	21	22
Moderately religious	40	17
Largely indifferent to religion	29	28
Basically opposed to religion	5	17
Prefer not to answer	3	0
No response	3	11
Variant	0	6

West-F faculty show a wider distribution of opinion than was true at West-E, but there was no surprise in these data unless it was the fact that, again, little difference is shown between the religious attitudes of these faculties and those in secular institutions. If strong religious commitment is expected from the faculty as a factor in the institution's character, then this commitment is not evident at West. But researchers did not get the impression from administrative interviews or from the school's publications that this commitment was expected from West's faculties or promoted as a feature of life there.

Innovation and experimentation in a college or university may contribute to that which identifies, unifies, and gives distinctiveness to an academic community. Therefore, both the faculty questionnaire and the student questionnaire used in this study contained several items that were intended to reveal participants' attitudes toward aspects of contemporary academic life that are widely regarded as innovative. These questionnaire items also provided a way for the investigators to check student and faculty perceptions of themes and curriculum arrangements that have been installed mainly by administrators and which have been promoted by the institutional hierarchy as distinguishing features of the university.

For example, West had emphasized through its administration that the university provided faculty with opportunities for innovation and that, additionally, West was gathering faculty who were committed to change and willing to become personally involved in it.

The faculty questionnaire asked respondents just how important an opportunity for innovation and experimentation was for them personally and, furthermore, how they thought their colleagues regarded this matter. Results showed a considerable difference between West-E and West-F faculties' attitudes toward innovation:

FQ2	Personal View (%)			View of Others (%)		
	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important
West-E	45	45	8	18	45	21
West-F	89	6	0	44	44	0

The 18% of the West-E respondents who considered an opportunity for innovation "Very important" to their faculty colleagues was the lowest proportion on this item among all participating schools. The 21% who said their peers regarded an opportunity for innovation as "Not important" was the highest proportion of any sample to draw this conclusion.

These data show that the faculty at West-E are far from unanimous in their personal support of innovation; there are likely to be many who are not willing to become involved in the administration's commitment to innovation. The West-F data suggest that West-F respondents showed some difficulty in transferring their personal involvement in innovation to colleagues. They were less confident that an opportunity for experimentation and innovation was "Very important" to their peers than they were about their own interest in such matters.

This conclusion was confirmed at another point in the questionnaire. Participants in the study were asked to scale colleagues, as personal observation allowed, on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of their college. What proportion of colleagues, they were asked, would be "willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures"? The key response options, with West-E, West-F, and CIT statistics follow:

FQ19	Most	About half	Some	Very few	No response
West-E (%)	10	29	53	8	0
West-F (%)	83	6	11	0	0
CIT (%)	20	23	43	9	0

Once again the West-E faculty, judged by data provided by their peers, lag well behind West-F. This is not surprising, given the emphasis on innovation in the cluster college. But, more significantly, the attitude of the West-E faculty does not appear to be any more favorable to change than is true of faculties in universities without a general commitment to innovation. Neither the pronouncements of West administrators nor the example of West-F seemed in 1966 to have had much effect on West-E faculty.

Respondents also were asked to estimate the proportion of their colleagues who could be described as "Not hostile to innovation, but unwilling to get involved personally."

FQ19

	Most	About half	Some	Very few	No response
West-E (%)	21	37	32	10	0
West-F (%)	11	11	28	50	0
CIT (%)	18	30	35	11	4

These data confirm that faculty at West-F are, generally speaking, committed to innovation, yet even there gradations of commitment are evident. West-E faculty members, on the other hand, show no greater enthusiasm for innovation than faculties elsewhere; in fact, they fall somewhat behind most other samples on this particular.

Attitudes toward educational changes in the context of larger societal issues were elicited through two questions. The data on these items indicate again considerable differences between the perspectives of the samples at West-E and West-F:

FQ15 Radical technological changes in our society necessitate radical changes in the educational experiences offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Can't say	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
West-E (%)	16	34	16	21	5	3
West-F (%)	39	17	0	22	0	0

Too much emphasis is presently being placed on innovation and experimentation in higher education. Existing standards and arrangements are sound and these should be achieved and utilized - not replaced.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Can't say	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
West-E (%)	8	32	16	34	8	3
West-F (%)	0	6	6	50	33	0

This last statement was in all probability evaluated by project samples in the context of developments within West University as well as with reference to higher education generally. If the judgments relate mainly to the local situation, or are at least influenced by local conditions, this may help to explain the fact that only two other institutions in the study showed as high a proportion of respondents as at West-E agreeing that there was too much emphasis on innovation and experimentation. There appears to be a reaction factor at work in these data--some West-E faculty may think the cluster college people overplay innovation. However, the point of interest to West administrators may be that the reaction has not been greater, given the spirited efforts on behalf of innovation in the university during recent years.

When specific innovations were presented in the questionnaire, the West-F faculty were consistently more interested in them than were West-E faculty. Respondents were asked at one point about the importance for them
FQ2 personally of "Interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities" and at another point they were asked what they thought about "Cross-
FQ12 disciplinary teaching." Data show that, on the first item, 26% of the West-E respondents considered such contacts and teaching opportunities "Very important," while 50% called them "Somewhat important." These data suggest that three-fourths of the West-E faculty might be responsive to innovation of this character. Only 24% regarded such matters as personally "Not important." The entire West-F sample supported interdisciplinary contacts and teaching opportunities (83% "Very important" and 17% "Somewhat important").

On the other questionnaire item, with its specific reference to cross-disciplinary teaching and its call to declare one's attitude toward this innovation, considered theoretically and not in connection with one's actual teaching situation, the record changes somewhat. About 24% of the West-E sample state that cross-disciplinary teaching is "Very important" to them, while 40% marked "Somewhat important" and 34% said "Not important." With the West-F sample, 78% said "Very important," 11% "Somewhat important," and 6% "Not important." The CIT response on this item was: 27% "Very important," 45% "Somewhat important," and 25% "Not important." West-E respondents showed slightly less enthusiasm for this form of innovation than is found in the composite total. Data on the respondent's "View of others" are available, but are noteworthy only in that the decline in support for the innovative among the samples, when comparing views of self with others, is rather less at West-E than the record from other schools would lead one to expect. West-E faculty judged others pretty much as they judged themselves.

Other specific forms of innovation were implied in the section of the questionnaire where faculty were asked to apply certain statements to their institution. One such statement read:

FQ14 There should be less emphasis on grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Can't say	Disagree	Strongly disagree
West-E (%)	21	55	5	13	3
CIT (%)	21	42	6	24	4

The close similarity to the composite total is immediately apparent, although this time West-E faculty revealed themselves to be slightly more innovatively inclined. Seventy-six percent of the West-E faculty sample were on the side of changes that might reduce the quantitative measurements by which educational accomplishments are presently judged. The chance for innovation in this area seems good.

Because West-F has been attempting innovations in grading, units of credit, and so forth, it was surprising to project staff to find the majority of respondents there on the side of further, presumably more radical changes in this connection. About 17% agreed strongly that there should be less emphasis upon the standard criteria, while 39% gave general agreement. Thirty-three percent disagreed, however, and 6% disagreed strongly. The West-F faculty, therefore, is divided on this matter. The questionnaire item may have been an especially inappropriate one for West-F because the question as stated mixed grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements. West-F had innovated radically in the first two areas while, to many observers, appearing to maintain considerable course rigidity. There is no way to tell what "screening" or selectivity West-F respondents used in handling this part of the questionnaire. Therefore, this item is of minimal value.

The importance of the context within which the respondent answers a question was vividly emphasized in another faculty questionnaire item dealing with a different aspect of innovation, student participation in governance. The question read:

FQ4 Should students at your college participate more significantly than they do at present in the formulation and implementation of academic policies, i.e., in establishing the content and organization of courses, on academic policy committees, by student-formed and student-led seminars?

The faculty response at West-E was 53% "Yes" and 45% "No." At West-F 33% said "Yes" and 61% "No." In this case, it was the West-F return that almost duplicated the percentages of the CIT--34% "Yes" and 62% "No."

The West-F faculty must have answered this question within the context of the considerable student advisory involvement in academic governance that has been characteristic of the college. A majority of faculty there thought the existing level to be sufficient. At West-E, where students have had little involvement even of an advisory sort in academic policy formulation, although they were involved in the governance of social life, the faculty sample was more sympathetic to change. This finding is especially interesting in view of the general conservatism of the West-E faculty toward most innovation. One possible explanation is that the collegial emphasis on governance at West-F has had a liberalizing effect on West-E faculty, enough indeed to cause them to go against the trend of faculty thinking elsewhere as revealed in the composite totals. But this is only speculation.

Several items from the student questionnaire served to draw out the views of entering freshmen on innovation and experimentation. By and large, the West-E students did not expect to find their college characterized by substantive curriculum changes, nor did they show any special interest in having West-E so characterized.

SQ47 Three-fourths of the West-E students considered their ideal college as one "traditional in most respects" rather than "experimental in most respects." This was the highest proportion of any entering class in the study to side with the "traditional." West-F students voted strongly the other way; 86% declared a preference for a college experimental in most respects. They were the most experimentally inclined of all samples.

These are the most intriguing findings of the West study. The extremes of the continuum of tradition-experimentation are found on the same campus.

The traditional-experimental issue was raised, though with a more particular focus, in the question dealing with the considerations that figured in the student's selection of his college. Only 3% of the students

SQ45 at West-E, the lowest percentage in the study, said that an important consideration in their coming to West-E was an "Opportunity to participate in experimental educational programs." Thirty-eight percent of the entering West-F class indicated the opportunity for participation in such programs was important to them. Only one other college in the project had a freshman class which gave greater attention to this variable.

However, significant proportions of students at both colleges show an interest in specific forms of innovation. In the questionnaire item dealing SQ47 with the characteristics of an ideal college, students were asked about the importance for them of lecture classes versus group discussion classes. Every respondent at West-F voted for group discussions. At West-E, 66% voted in favor of discussion type classes and 32% favored lecture classes. This was again a comparatively conservative response by the West-E sample. No other student sample gave as high a proportion of their support to lecture classes. Nearly 77% of the West-E respondents stated a preference for a college emphasizing independent study, compared to 98% of the entering freshmen at West-F. On pass-fail versus letter grades, the West-E student sample was divided, with 57% favoring letter grades and 42% prefering pass-fail. In this respect, the West-E freshmen were closely akin to students at the other,older college and university campuses of the study. It was only in the new semi-autonomous cluster colleges that students favored the innovative grading method. At West-F, for example, where a form of the pass-fail system is used, 92% of the entering class voted for pass-fail.

Students were also asked:

SQ30 How do you feel about competing with other students for grades and recognition?

	West-E (%)	West-F (%)
I very much dislike it and prefer to avoid it.	12	18
I dislike it somewhat.	27	24
I have neutral feelings about this.	20	20
I like it somewhat.	29	30
I like it very much.	10	8

A significant number of students in West-E are at least curious about curricular changes, the preceding tables show, but they have no illusions about what they will get in the actual curriculum of their college. The college is not regarded as having innovation as a mark of distinctiveness. The reverse is true at West-F. Again there is the curiosity and also the predisposition, but in that college practices may be in some ways more radical than entering students have imagined.

By and large, West-F's entering class is better informed of the prospects for innovation than is true at West-E. When asked how much they SQ46 knew at entrance about "The availability of specialized, independent courses of study," 33% at West-F, the highest proportion of any project sample, professed to know a lot about these matters, 56% said they knew at least a little, while 9% said they knew nothing about it. At West-E 17% claimed considerable knowledge in this realm, 64% thought they knew a little, while 18% were, they said, without information.

This comparatively high degree of knowledge about and identification with the unique features of West-F by its entering freshmen could be due to the controversial nature of the program. Precisely because it is

radically innovative, students may have taken the time to learn more about it and, at entrance, they are better informed. Their choices, in most cases, appear to be deliberate. This conclusion is based in part on data from a
SQ40 questionnaire item in which students were asked whether anyone had discouraged them from coming to the college of their choice. Some 44% of the West-F freshmen said "Yes," and 56% said "No." At West-E the figures were 36% "Yes" and 64% "No." West-F had the highest percentage of freshmen encountering opposition, whereas the West-E percentage is about comparable to findings at other places. The greatest number of arguments raised against West-F, according to student data, dealt with its being "Too expensive" (34%), "Too much academic pressure" (19%), "Type of people attending" (14%), or "Geographical location" (13%).

It is evident that students entering West-F see their college as a special sort of place and that freshmen at West-E have a different image of their college, yet also consider it special. The question was raised:
SQ44 "Does this college have special qualities that distinguish it from others?" All West-F respondents reported that the college did have special qualities. About 70% of the West-E sample said their college had special qualities. Data show that what students mean by distinguishing qualities varies greatly, but at West-F the emphasis seems to center finally on the fact that the college offers a variety of special features that tend to individualize and personalize the student's educational experience, and attention is also given to the intellectual rigor of the program. The distinguishing characteristic at West-E, so far as we can tell, is its emphasis on community. When students listed considerations in selecting their college, West-E
SQ45 respondents specified "community" as important in 71% of the cases--this

was the highest percentage given any of the fifteen options of this question by students from this college. West-F freshmen were equally enthusiastic about community--82% of them listed it as important in the selection of their college.

The importance of the concept of community in West University will come as no surprise to leaders there. This emphasis and its attraction have long prevailed. But the challenge for this university in the future is to develop a way for the spirit of community to be maintained in the presence of substantial diversity. The cluster college concept provides opportunities for community spirit within the small subunits, but the university's traditional unity may be threatened in direct proportion to the growth of that spirit within the several cluster colleges. Since West-E has been the bearer of that tradition but has yet to define its future, it stands to lose most in this present transaction. When West-E and West University were essentially synonymous, the college could claim the university's reputation for community. With the development of the cluster colleges, each having its own sense of community, and with an expanding network of campuses on which there are to be ever more graduate and professional programs, West-E will no longer be able to claim to be the repository for that spirit of unity and family loyalty that has heretofore been the school's main appeal for students.

West-E, like most American institutions of higher education, has judged its mission by quantitative norms--grades, units of credit, and other conventional criteria. Now, as with other colleges and universities, West-E must think anew of the character of its mission and it must do so in qualitative terms. The college literature asserts the liberal arts ideal, but the program of study seems vocationally oriented. The students are self-satisfied, pleasant, socially and politically conservative, and academically placid. They are good, clean, middle to upper class youth who think most of the time about how to get ready for daddy's business and with whom to set up their own homestead. This judgment is confirmed by data from the Omnibus Personality Inventory, as is the assertion that they do not show a high intellectual disposition.

West-F students incline the other way. They rank high on OPI scales showing intellectual disposition; they rank low in practicality, orderliness, and conventional social and personality characteristics. Perhaps the most important conclusion for this study, as said before, is that the extremes of the various measures have appeared on the same campus.

The faculty at West-E seem to be increasingly committed to the conventional standard of institutional excellence: They want better students as judged by standard criteria; they are concerned for faculty specialization, degrees, research; and they want administrators who defend academic freedom and raise money. The West-F faculty may not be able to sustain the fundamental commitments that originally characterized that community. At the time of the study, the faculty seemed to be dividing into factions and interest groups or taking refuge in various forms of privatism. There was a strong possibility that the West-F faculty would end up in the condition from which the West-E faculty was beginning to seek ways to extricate itself. The prospect loomed that the West-F faculty would join colleagues at West-E in adhering to the conventional criteria of institutional excellence. And, if this happens, both faculties might come to define their colleges in terms that were alien to the university's historic goal--liberal education--as well as to West's contemporary commitment to innovation and change.

CHAPTER IX

UNIWESTERN

One of the principal concerns of certain members of the Institutional Character Study research staff was for what they regarded to be the spirit of apathy in faculty and administration at most colleges and universities toward the delineation of broad institutional purposes and general normative values. What Kenneth Boulding has called the "integrative system" was, it seemed, either assumed to exist in most institutions and to have general approval, or denounced as unnecessary, or simply ignored. For whatever reasons, faculty tended to concentrate on departmental considerations and their own subject matter specializations; most administrators seemed bent on greasing the wheels of the educational establishment and then getting out of the way; chancellors and presidents, when asked about the unifying assumptions, values, and goals that might give distinctiveness to their institutions usually said something about teaching, research, and public service, showed their plans for new facilities, and eased out the door to a Rotary luncheon. Among the principal interest groups on most campuses there appeared to be a paucity of attention to normative values. Institutions of higher learning were threatened, it seemed, in a day of profound social change, with a value vacuum on campus that could be filled by the will of militant subcultures whose adherents knew what they wanted if not what society needed.

What are the values present in academe, and what difference do they make? Is every college or university, to paraphrase Pitirim Sorokin's question about cultures, "an integrated whole, where no essential part is incidental but each is organically connected with the rest?" Or are they, again as Sorokin put it with reference to culture, "mere spatial congeries of cultural objects, values, traits, which have drifted fortuitously together and are united only by their spatial adjacency, just by the fact that they are thrown together, and by nothing more? (Sorokin, 1957, p. 2)." If it is the first, what is the principle of integration? If the second, what holds the disparate conglomeration together?

In May and June 1966, four campuses of UniWestern were enlisted in the Institutional Character project--U-G, U-H, U-I and U-J. The selections were deliberate. Project personnel wanted two of the older components of the university and two of the new campuses for comparison. In addition, all four of those selected satisfied criteria set down for inclusion in the project: they were all in the process of substantial change, and the two older campuses were thought to have distinctive forms--U-G, with its expansion out of the agricultural tradition, its bicycles and smiles; U-I, all sun, surf, and energy--while the new locations, U-H and U-J, were claiming distinctiveness through innovation and experimentation.

In the fall of 1966, 234 faculty questionnaires were mailed to U-G faculty. This was a 33% sample of those involved, as best the researchers could determine, in undergraduate teaching. One hundred fifty-two questionnaires were returned, 65% of the sample polled and about 22% of the total faculty.

At U-J, sixty-nine faculty questionnaires were circulated to a faculty estimated at the time to number 186. Thus, 37% of that faculty were contacted. The returns from the U-J campus were proportionately smaller than for any school in the study. Eighteen faculty questionnaires were returned, 26% of our sample and only 10% of the full-time faculty.

The response at U-I was considerably better. From a faculty numbering some 420, project personnel selected a sample of 169 that was stratified to include, here as elsewhere, distribution through the ranks as well as by disciplines. This was a 40% sample of the total. U-I faculty returned ninety-five questionnaires, 56% of the total number distributed, providing a working sample of 23% of the full-time faculty.

In the fall of 1966, the faculty at U-H was small. Thirty out of the forty-two persons then associated with the cluster college here designated U-H_1 and thirty out of the thirty-nine then at U-H_2 were polled. Thus 71% and 77% of the faculties in that campus' first two colleges were contacted. The returns were adequate to the needs of the study. Fourteen questionnaires came back from U-H_1 faculty and sixteen from U-H_2--a 47% response from the first college and 53% from the second. This meant that there was representation from 33% of the full-time teaching faculty at U-H_1 and 41% of faculty at U-H_2.

Entering freshmen classes at all four campuses, excepting only U-H_1, received in September 1966 the student questionnaire designed for the project, as well as the Omnibus Personality Inventory. Student questionnaires returned by schools numbered as follows: U-G--1523; U-J--480; U-I--2676; and U-H--213. This questionnaire contained seventy-four items, but only thirty-two of them were thought to be relevant for the Institutional

Character Study.*

Key administrators on participating campuses were interviewed during the 1966-67 academic year. The number interviewed per campus averaged eight. Each campus was visited three times for administrative interviews with four persons at the Center responsible for these contacts. Conversations with administrators were thematically structured and each lasted from thirty minutes to two hours. Interviewers recorded their summaries of what transpired on tape immediately after the sessions or, in some cases, reports were made in writing. Administrators contacted seemed at ease and showed no hesitation about cooperating in the study.

General Institutional Objectives

The catalogs of the campuses of UniWestern do not carry statements on the university's philosophy of education or the general educational objectives of the institution. No attempt is made to define liberal education or to state the responsibilities and privileges of the modern university. The culture of the institution is not described; the academic community is not defined. These matters are mentioned in various special publications, as in Unity and Diversity, the Academic Plan of /Uni-Western/ 1965-1975, issued by the president's office. There, in a section of the report titled "The Role of the University," the reader is told that the university is "responsive to the needs of its state and of society and to the traditional free inquiry that has governed great Western universities since their medieval origins." Furthermore:

---

*Researchers in Program I at the Center are analyzing the complete student questionnaire, and the Omnibus Personality Inventory Scales, and their findings will be reported separately.

> Universities today play a vital role in the preservation of free societies. They are the principal center for the discovery and publication of new ideas; they preserve the heritage of the past for future generations; they maintain precious freedom to explore all points of view; they instruct the young and the mature alike in the most fundamental conceptions and advanced skills known to our civilization. Increasingly, their contributions are being recognized as basic to the vitality of our culture, the prosperity of free economics, and the very survival of freedom.

This document emphasizes that the achievement of distinction in the years ahead will be conditioned by five overriding imperatives, then six are named: Growth, "The State . . . . is faced with a burgeoning population. . ."; Diversity, "The University will strive deliberately to foster diversity among its campuses, so as to present the broadest range of high-quality educational opportunities to the people of [the State]"; Balance, ". . . an appropriate balance must be achieved and sustained among the basic academic disciplines. . ."; Perspective, "A great University has a duty to the future as great as its duty to the present. . . . Intellectually it must be both more conservative of established values and more bold in trying innovations than may be fashionable at any given moment"; Freedom, "Originality and creativity cannot long breathe any other air"; Responsibility, "Self-restraint, mutual tolerance, and shared concern for the good of the whole community are the obligations of freedom."

Nowhere in this document, or in others known to the research staff, are the most basic questions raised, questions such as, what do men have in common, now? What is the basis for authority, now? At a time when doubts are being raised not only about the efficiency and flexibility of institutional arrangements but also about their very rationale and necessity, when the institutions of higher education, qua institutions, are required to show the validity of their structures and functions, researchers found it disturbing that the university's major publications gave no indication that the institution was consciously, actively probing its assumptions, goals, and values. And the attendant fear was that, in this case, the literature faithfully reflected the general condition in the university.

Yet two qualifications on these judgments must be given: First, this university is in this connection no better or worse than other large educational institutions, public or private. All such places have, generally speaking, no sense of the whole. Secondly, the new campuses of the university, especially the two in this study--U-J and U-H--have put into their printed materials various statements calculated to show their determination to establish an educational philosophy and follow a set of general objectives. And the authorization for substantive diversity had come from the president's office:

> Major differences of emphasis are being planned among new campuses. . . . As each campus also develops its own individual character, vision of excellence, and sense of history, its students, faculty, and staff are better able to engage imaginatively in the enterprise of discovering knowledge.

But the implementation of the president's mandate was left to the individual campuses. One purpose of this study was to see how that task was defined on certain of these campuses, how and if it was being carried out, and what the consequences were.

In the following section of the report, perspectives on educational philosophy and institutional objectives provided by the administrators interviewed, plus the relevant literature, will be considered for each of the four UniWestern campuses involved in the study.

U-G

At U-G, the conversations with the administrators tended to focus on the relationship of the campus to the central administration of the university. The consensus among those interviewed was that statewide administration had tried to give individual campuses sufficient freedom for innovation as well as growth, but that, despite theoretical autonomy, statewide budgetary allocations were handled so as to encourage conformity and discourage innovation. One administrator illustrated the problem by referring to the difficulty in getting money for computer runs necessary for the servicing of innovative admissions procedures. In order to test out this particular registration change, computers at the county office and a local dairy were used.

A further complication was created by university regulations specifying a strict division of labor for administrators, faculty, and students on the several campuses. The consequences have been, first, the creation of a separate administrative caste, working, thinking, talking with their own kind, while the same thing was happening for faculty and students, and with the result that it was difficult for any one of these interest groups to understand the needs and feelings of another. Second, these rigid divisions destroyed the prospects for a community attack on problems or any sort of broad, integrative planning. Thus it became exceedingly difficult to form a philosophy of education or general institutional objectives except, as is now the case, for statements carrying the most superficial, general meanings.

While certain U-G administrators complained about the leveling effect of statewide regulations and guidelines, U-G's administrative leaders professed to be committed to keeping certain U-G traditions intact. One was the tradition of friendliness. The chancellor and others emphasized various structural arrangements whereby students and faculty were encouraged to meet (e.g., beautiful lounges at strategic locations, with money provided for student-faculty coffee times, or the "lodges" along the creek that traverses the campus, two of which were near the main buildings where students and faculty could meet for classes and conversation). Administrators seemed to put great stock in their ability to facilitate friendly encounters.

The chancellor's door has always been open to students, visiting researchers were repeatedly told. But the researchers noted that the chancellor's office had been moved during the year of this study to the top floor of a new administrative building some distance from the main flow of student and faculty traffic, and they got the impression that the university was growing too large to permit the same measure of informality and immediacy that had characterized the years prior to the expansion program. However, the dean of students was remaining (1966-67) in one of the old, centrally located cottages and was eating in a different student dining hall at least three days a week. The academic vice chancellor invited more than one hundred students to lunch or dinner at his home in the year prior to the study. U-G still appeared to be, despite its new buildings and numerical growth, friendly and comparatively relaxed. There was some substance to one administrator's claim that the essential distinction of U-G could be reduced to the word "friendliness" or, perhaps, "courtesy."

But, acknowledged administrative leaders, changes were coming--a school of medicine, a school of law, a more professionally oriented faculty in arts and sciences. It was evident that the distinctiveness of U-G in the future would be different from the past. Already there was some awareness of the radical changes confronting the culture of the campus--as symbolized by the stress and strain in the student body during the year of the study over the continuation of the "Wild West Days" funfest (cancelled by the student body president, but with petitions circulating to have it revived) and the controversy over the appearance of the San Francisco Mime Troupe (cancelled by the chancellor, in conjunction with the student body president, but with this decision later reversed and the performance arranged for at a later time). However, there was, so far as project staff could determine, no group at U-G thinking about the tacit assumptions that should provide the basis for community on a campus where community was deemed important but where neither the "ag tradition," nor the bicycles, nor the coffee lounges were likely to provide it any longer.

The faculty were drawing more and more into the security of their various specializations--this despite the efforts of the academic vice chancellor, who had the task of helping to assimilate 145 new faculty in 1965 and over ninety in 1966, and who had arranged at fall orientation time to divide the newcomers into subgroups with deans distributed among them, all in the interest of encouraging community. Administrators, meantime, were more and more sacrificing faculty fellowship for administrative efficiency. They were so busy with buildings, budgets, and state politics that they could do nothing more than provide the structural supports for community. They had less and less time to be a part of it. Students, meantime, were becoming diversified in values, though--as both the student questionnaire and the Omnibus Personality Inventory data show--

they were still largely straight-line, middle class youth. They were, however, at least beginning to ask more often the very questions about the nature of the university that faculty and administrators found harder and harder to answer.

Aside from the emphasis on friendliness and the spirit of community, administrators interviewed at the U-G campus defined the university's distinctiveness according to the conventional criteria of institutional excellence. They were committed to achieving distinction for the campus by hiring a professionally oriented faculty, by securing motivated and hard-working students--as judged by standard criteria--and, at the level of their own responsibilities, by achieving efficiency, order, numerical and material growth for their campus under the terms of guidelines set by the statewide administration. They might disagree about the means to be employed in the achievement of ends about which, it seemed, there was very little disagreement. There was not, in 1966-67, so far as we could tell, any uncertainty in their thinking about the ends of education, about the assumptions, values, and goals of the university, about the role of that campus in the state's educational system or about the meaning of service and the forms that service should take. To the extent that fundamental values could be ascertained, and it was usually difficult to get administrators to talk about them, it seemed clear that the traditional definitions of the nature of the university as a center of service to the public and to the values of the culture were assumed to be good. Administrators were busy implementing, facilitating, organizing. They were thinking about education for a new time, but largely in the quantitative sense. They showed no philosophical sophistication, no inclination to challenge the values behind the forms by which they worked.

There were, however, occasional moments when it seemed that certain of these administrators wished for time to think seriously about the philosophy of mass public education, about the new youth movement with its new/old morality, about the possibility that today the university is obliged to stand in a new service connection--to serve as a center of countervailing power to the nation-state. But these few had no time for all that, even as others saw no need for it. In 1966-67, at U-G as elsewhere, very few were hearing the questions and almost no one was working on the answers.

U-J

Given the emphases of this research project on educational philosophy, the conventional standard of institutional excellence, and innovation and experimentation, U-J seemed to be an especially appropriate candidate for the study. With a distinguished institute of oceanography as a nucleus, this campus of the university had started at the graduate level, widening its program in 1959 to a school of science and engineering five years before admission of the first undergraduates. Indeed, until 1966, graduate students outnumbered undergraduates and more research dollars per faculty member had flowed to this campus than to any other in the world. As a brochure quotation put it:

> [U-J] has started at a higher level of distinction than any university since Johns Hopkins in 1876, and Chicago and Stanford in the early 1890's.

It seemed certain, therefore, that the conventional standard of institutional excellence would be well represented at U-J.

Nevertheless, in 1966 there was considerable impetus toward innovation and experimentation. The long-range academic plan for U-J was unique, proposing to divide 27,500 students into twelve colleges of about 2300 students each. Each college was to have not only a distinctive architecture but also a distinctive academic character. Each was to have its own characteristic orientation in each of the divisions of the liberal arts--natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. The student would have at least two-thirds of his curriculum in the college in which he was enrolled and not more than a third in adjacent colleges. Four colleges would be grouped together, colleges varying in style and emphasis but, taken together, offering nearly the full curriculum of the university.

There seemed to be, therefore, every reason to think that the concern of the project for innovation and experimentation in undergraduate education would be well met at U-J. The publications of the new campus claimed that it was unique and, if the colleges could combine on that campus a commitment to the conventional criteria of institutional excellence and a commitment to innovation and experimentation, they would indeed be unique. Were this to be done, the third of the project's areas of interest would be prominently featured there. If the U-J campus were to carry out its ambitious intentions to achieve distinction by both the standard of the status quo and the mandate of change, it would certainly give attention, researchers thought, to the creation of an integrative value system appropriate to its vision.

Administrative Perspectives on Institutional Objectives

Interviews with key administrators made it clear thet they were basically satisfied with the conventional criteria of academic excellence. There was general support among them for the idea of having the university organized by departments and specializations, with standard criteria emphasized in the selection of faculty, with a division of responsibility whereby the academic senate controlled curriculum and corresponding programs and the administration handled public, political, fiscal, and structural matters. There seemed to be no uneasiness about the notion that the faculty's relationship with students should be essentially tutelary and is in fact asymmetrical, or with the tradition that the university should be characterized by rational discourse and intellectual analysis. Administration seemed satisfied that the meaning of liberal education or humane learning was known and generally accepted and that the conventional standard was the way by which this meaning was to be measured.

The embodiment of the standard for U-J administrators was, it seemed to us, the oldest and most prestigious of the university's campuses. They were consciously or unconsciously tied to the structures and functions, to the values and norms of that place. Researchers got the impression, encouraged by several explicit statements from administrators, that they regarded their campus as the emerging standard for their part of the state and that they were out to emulate their precursor, and, if possible, surpass it. Their attitude and intent seemed to be "more of the same, done better."

What, then, would be the role of innovation and experimentation on this new campus? First it was pointed out by one administrator that innovation had been possible within UniWestern before the president's decentralization plan of 1964 and that, on the other hand, there was no more likelihood of change since 1964 than there had been before. The findings of this project support that comment. Despite the emphasis of the printed materials that "the old forms, not the new, must defend themselves here," which might suggest radical intentions, conversations with administrators gave the conclusion that innovations were to be used as new means to established ends, or as new forms of old values, and that experimentation defined as new means to new or open ends was not the picture at all.

The chief administrators, for example, emphasized that in their opinion the development most likely to be the distinctive feature at U-J would not be the clustering of the colleges, as unique as that arrangement was, but rather the combining of truly distinguished graduate programs and a faculty oriented unapologetically to graduate level work and academic specialization with an effective undergraduate program in the liberal arts characterized by a vital relationship between students and their renowned faculty. The innovations that interested administrative representatives were those that would bring this high-powered faculty into contact with lower division students without jeopardizing the professional commitments of the faculty to research and publication and yet would assure students of a shared learning experience that would fulfill their best expectations of a liberal education. This honorable and traditional goal has not been achieved at the "model" campus, at least not with lower division students, but U-J somehow would do what their sister institution had not done.

It should not be implied that the administrators were unaware of the problems of the departmental structure and general faculty conservatism which faced their determination to innovate. The emphasis at U-J has been on hiring distinguished faculty and giving them freedom to follow their own interests. Thus, since it has also been a part of the policy to hire the department chairmen first, these distinguished department chairmen have inclined to develop the department according to their own experiences, values, and professional preferences. Several administrators acknowledged these problems, particularly the provost of the new colleges. But they, like the others, fell back when pressed on these matters to their buoyant and persistent optimism--the optimism of new beginnings--that somehow they would be able to find faculty who were interested in teaching and educational reform, in a philosophy of education for a new era as well as in research and publication, and to success by national guild standards, even though, as they admitted, other institutions would presumably have been equally pleased to find such men but have not been able to find and hold them in sufficient numbers to achieve substantive innovations and change.

The New Colleges

It is interesting to note that the innovations instituted at U-J_1, the first of U-J's academic subunits and the only college in operation at the time of the study, had already (1966-67) come under attack from some campus administrators because of the problems they entailed. Several of the colleges' breadth and sequence requirements were being criticized--the breadth requirement with its heavy concentration in science was said to be drawing a certain type of student into the college, many of whom were getting stuck in the language requirement. More than half the students had at the time of the study not satisfied the language proficiency exam which was declared to be prerequisite to junior standing, yet these students had been advanced to junior standing. Most of the seniors scheduled to graduate in 1967 had not passed these written and oral language exams, and it seemed likely that various language tracks would have to be set up (in math and science there were already three tracks--an honors track, a high and an ordinary track). But the point here is not to become involved in the merits or deficiences of specific innovations. Rather, the point to be made is that some U-J spokesmen gave the impression that innovation would be welcomed only within the limits of assured success. The quickness with which criticism and impatience arose suggested a low tolerance for innovations that irritate or for those that do not facilitate conventional thinking.

U-J_1 had other innovations, in addition to its breadth requirements; such as setting aside units of credit as graduation criteria in favor of a prescribed number of courses, including a three quarter math sequence and five quarters with courses in the humanistic tradition. The college, however, was conventional in having the curriculum organized by departments, in the structured class arrangements and course content, and in the use of conventional letter grades.

U-J_2 was being planned at the time of the research study but the innovations that were to provide the curricular distinctiveness of the college struck research analysts as familiar ones having to do with the restructuring of courses, a greater emphasis on cross-disciplinary contacts, and a more open, elective system of course selection than was true at U-J_1. While U-J_1 had a prescribed lower division curriculum in the liberal arts, with the student going over into a major for his upper division program, U-J_2 students could have greater lower division flexibility, and a chance to develop a "specialization" in the junior and senior years, rather than being identified with a typical major.

One area in which it was evident that U-J_2 planners were drawing on the experience of U-J_1, with the intent of departing from it, was in facilities planning. The provost and early faculty were working at the time of the study to bring the thinking of the architects more in line with the educational philosophy and program emphases of U-J_2. There had been a four-day meeting at which time the provost had spelled out at great length for the architects the purpose and expectations of the U-J_2 curriculum. As a result, a consortium of architects was established to take advantage of the insights and ideas of one particular architect who had caught the faculty's educational intentions best. From this time on, a closer and more purposeful working relationship had been established. Also, a student committee was drawn into the planning of the residence halls and it was said they had made significant contributions to this endeavor.

These developments emphasize a problem that all new colleges face. The lead time requirement for facilities construction means either that buildings are constructed with little or no knowledge of the uses to which they will be put, innovative or not, or a faculty-administration planning team must be hired so early that few institutions can afford to have them around long enough to reach agreement on the functions and philosophy of the proposed college in order to give guidance to those responsible for the design and construction of facilities.

In our opinion one of the most innovative features of this campus of UniWestern has been the creation of a "staging area" where a new college is housed for two years while the facilities for that program are still under construction elsewhere on the campus. Thus, at least some faculty and most administrators for the new college are on hand early enough to exercise some influence on facilities planning.

Yet again, this innovation pertains to structural and organizational considerations and there was very little evidence in 1966-67 that administrators at U-J were interested in radical curriculum changes or new value orientations for colleges that had been declared to be free to challenge every educational assumption and condition.

Leadership for Change

One of the most complex and perplexing questions regarding the prospects for innovation at U-J has to do with the range and authority of administrative leadership. The impression gained by project interviewers was that university administrators on this campus did not believe that they were in a position to provide significant leadership in academic affairs. The curriculum, they said, was in the hands of faculty, and the administration was important only as a conciliator and adjudicator of faculty aspirations or faculty factions. Caught between statewide regulations on the one hand, and the autonomy of a strong-willed faculty on the other, administrators were not sanguine about their ability to effect curriculum changes. And yet this campus had been given encouragement by the university president to innovate, and decentralization was expected to make it possible.

Furthermore, this campus had from the beginning declared itself to be a place well disposed to change in all areas of its life. It sought to establish an image of ferment, criticism, and openness to new ideas. As a provost promised, "It will not be a comfortable place for those whose minds are made up." Whence was leadership for such change and innovation to come? From faculty? But their interests and traditions were in graduate education, in specializations, in those very arrangements and experiences that had in recent years come under so much justifiable criticism, and away from which it seemed necessary to move. Such leadership must come, at least in large part, from administrators who alone would have a sense of the whole. Yet the curriculum was an area closed to them.

Certain U-J administrators did, in fact, sense the need for leadership in academic matters, and they acknowledged the likelihood that the administration would have to lead the way if changes were to be noteworthy. It was with this concern in mind that a decision had been made in 1966-67 to bring administrators more actively into the planning of curricula for new colleges. They had been involved very little at U-J_1, somewhat more with U-J_2, and it was said that there would be a joint faculty-administration committee for the planning of the curriculum for College III.

The question of the authority structure of the university and provision for leadership therein deserves attention. The role of the provosts in the administrative hierarchy of UniWestern is a particular area in which clarification is needed. To the present time their power and authority has been circumscribed by the faculty on one side and the university administration on the other. They must measure up to the criteria of academic professionalism to be acceptable to faculty--that means teaching experience, research, and publications. And they must have administrative skills, political sensitivity, and "integrative" talents to succeed with central administration and the general public. Since they are the administrators closest to students, they must also be willing to represent student interests and, if necessary, act as buffer between students, faculty, and central administrators. At U-J and elsewhere, there has been a rapid turnover of provosts, and the complexity of their task plus the ambiguity at the point of their authority and responsibility must be regarded as contributing factors. This, then, is one dimension of the larger problem. Administrative leadership is clearly needed but, to date, the opportunities for it have not been tested. Most administrators in key positions have come from highly structured situations where their rewards and sanctions were specified, and they have, consequently, imposed past conditions on new opportunities. Rather than regarding the ambiguity of the new situation as an opportunity for leadership, they have inclined to draw back waiting for the old, familiar lines of authority and responsibility to emerge and give them guidance. There is not an excess but a paucity of courage.

Another possible source of leadership for innovation is the student body. Later in this report student data from U-J will be presented, some of which bears on this point, but here comments will be limited to what was learned through interviews about administrative attitudes toward student participation in academic governance. Researchers were surprised to discover that in 1966-67 the majority of administrators interviewed at U-J were strongly opposed to student involvement in planning and implementing academic programs. Students are conservative, provincial, and self-satisfied, it was said; they concentrate on personal affairs and professional study, and it was a myth to see them as true activists. It was popular, said one administrator, for some students to take on the "Berkeley style," but he had no use for them. He also said that students have little contribution to make on committees charged with the formulation of academic policies and to put them there would only create sham and unnecessary obstructions.

A student "uprising" on campus in 1965 was cited by two administrators as illustrative of the fact that students cannot understand the multiple facets of committee work and, furthermore, as a development entirely harmful to the campus. This incident caused some faculty to change, it was said, from a position of advocacy for student involvement to one of conservatism emphasizing faculty autonomy in academic planning. Yet two other administrators were more favorably disposed to students and thought the 1965 student agitation had forced the administrators to think of ways to better the undergraduate collegiate program.

U-J Summary of Administrative Views

From the sum of administrative interviews, visitors concluded that the conventional standards of institutional excellence were well established at U-J. A philosophy of education and educational objectives appropriate for a public university in a time of radical social change were not matters under spirited and serious analysis at the time of project visits. It was assumed that general educational objectives had been set for the university as a whole and that they were sound. Finally, it seemed that U-J's distinction in graduate education and faculty research had become a formidable obstacle to the achievement of proposed undergraduate innovations. On this campus, as elsewhere, a characteristic that has given the institution distinction, in this case, graduate specialization, was acting to inhibit change.

U-I

It is frequently said that the U-J campus is being built from the top down, from graduate to undergraduate, while at another campus of UniWestern the attempt is to create an "instant" university, both graduate and undergraduate, and at U-H, beginning as they did with the college plan and with the intention of creating graduate units later, the campus is being built from the bottom up. However, it may be U-I, not U-H, that is building from the bottom up. At least it must be said that, given the value priorities of the university, U-I began much farther down the ladder than U-H. They began at the "bottom," as a teachers college, and from "nowhere" are now moving toward full parity in the university system.

Interviews with administrators made it clear that an institutional course had been set to give U-I full university standing--in size and in the variety of programs, undergraduate and graduate, in colleges, centers and institutes--and that the residue of faculty from the old teachers college days, as well as those from the era in which U-I was intended to be the elite liberal arts campus of the university, would be expected to adjust to the new challenge. It was apparent to campus visitors from the project that most administrators at U-I felt that they had been given such a mandate from "statewide," the president and regents, and it was their intention to carry it out.

It was acknowledged that some faculty had been hesitant to carry out the long-range plan, in part out of academic idealism--they feared that the liberal arts would be deemphasized--and in part for pragmatic reasons--they doubted that the present campus could handle the large numbers of students assigned to it. But the administration argued that in order to achieve what the faculty wanted it would be necessary to pay the price of large size.

Most administrators project personnel encountered seemed to have adjusted their thinking to accept the accoutrements of the large complex university, even though some of these trappings have come under attack in recent years. One administrator, for example, stated that U-I would make increasing use of teaching assistants and large classes. And he made a spirited defense of both. In defending the use of TA's he spoke of their closeness to students and their freshness in the subject matter. Then, defending large lectures, he spoke of the advantage in having one capable lecturer work before several hundred people rather than having several less skilled and less well trained teachers work with small groups of students. This same administrator also argued that large classes were necessary to pay for small ones.

At no point in discussions with key administrators did interviewers sense uncertainty on their part concerning the university's basic educational objectives and main arrangements. No inclinations to holistic innovation such as revising the role of the university vis-à-vis the contemporary society, or such as radically changing the authority structure of the institution of higher education, were manifest. There seemed to be no anxiety about having centralized administration or about the likelihood that it may encourage operational efficiency but discourage personal creativity. In fact, certain administrators made a point of claiming that relationships between this campus and statewide offices had been good, first, because of a number of personal friendships and, second, because of the willingness of administrators at U-I to "play ball" with statewide officials.

One administrator illustrated the latter point by citing an incident that had occurred two years before the study when an appeal was made from statewide officers for university campuses to accept more student applicants than had been initially projected on their growth charts. The U-I administrators decided to cooperate, despite the crowding of facilities that this change would necessitate. The administrator's comment was that he was sure statewide officers were grateful for this sort of flexibility and accommodation and that, in return, U-I could expect cooperation from "statewide" in the rapid development of its graduate programs. The effect of this decision on the undergraduate student's educational experience was not discussed, although, surely, the administrators must have been confident that no essential sacrifice of quality would result.

However, some qualitative effects must have accompanied this and other quantitative decisions. At the time of the study, U-I was running over 30% behind its building schedule while being at the same time 20% to 30% ahead of student enrollment projections. And, after experiencing a comparatively modest student population growth rate for several years, this campus was increasing its student enrollment 20% to 30% per year at the time of the project. So, the decision of the administrators at U-I to be good "company men," as two of them put it, suggests their concept of organizational leadership, even as their repeated use in the interviews of expressions such as "the people of the state must be served" and "those students who qualify must be accepted" suggest their philosophy of education. Incidents such as these are, in fact, very revealing. They show that institutions, like individuals, do not operate in a value vacuum. Institutional representatives may not declare the tacit assumptions by which their programs are directed. They may even play down the need for thematic conceptualizations; they may claim to be action oriented. Nevertheless, the institution is defining itself by some sort of norms and in these it also finds its validation.

The priorities of U-I, as listed by one of the chief administrators, were: First, to balance the undergraduate program with strong, varied graduate offerings. The campus had suffered, he said, by having its direction and image changed several times, but now the plans for the future were definite. A second priority was the establishment of institutes, centers, and special programs. The U-I campus provided the base for the university's overseas study options, and there had been several other special programs, but, by and large, this campus had not developed a variety of centers and institutes. Such a development was seen as part of U-I's expansion into the status and complexity of a general university campus. The third priority of the administration was the establishment of new and innovative programs.

Innovations at U-I

A major innovation under discussion in 1966-67, one that did come into being later on, was a college specially designed for creative students. The first announcement stated that this college would be

> a separate academic unit, separately staffed and administered, with a special curriculum and a specially selected group of students.

The innovative nature of the program, and this is one proposal at U-I that did show promise of being innovative to the point of being truly experimental, was shown in the following quotation from the brochure announcing the college:

> Each student will be enrolled on the evidence of a capacity for intellectual pursuit, discovery, and reformulation of a particular art or science. Each course in the College curriculum will offer the student, not an exposure to a predetermined quantity of fixed subject matter, but an occasion for exploring and modifying a field of knowledge.

Other innovative features in this special curriculum were the lack of prerequisites for courses, the absence of upper division or lower division designations for courses, and, indeed, the fact that there would be no specific required courses. Instead, each student was to be required to take a minimum of two courses in each of the six curriculum areas. Freedom would also be limited by an emphasis on units of credit, albeit a student could receive any number of units from zero to six with this detail worked out for individual courses with instructors. One hundred eighty units of credit would qualify the student for graduation. Courses could be taken in academic departments, and each student would be expected to maintain a 2.0 grade point average in courses taken in the new college.

Another interesting feature of this program for creative students is that it was an example of an innovative idea that came out of the faculty and became organized largely by faculty initiative. A professor of English who had been a rather sharp critic of university policy had been drawn into the chancellor's office to work on the master plan, and this innovative college was the product of his thinking. Administrators contacted showed no resentment about these developments. Indeed, as at U-J, the prevailing opinion was that the faculty academic senate was so strong that academic changes must come from faculty thinking or by planting the idea with faculty so as to preserve the appearance of faculty initiative and faculty control. Administrative leadership, it was said, must be subtle and indirect if it is to be persuasive. There was considerable enthusiasm among administrators on this campus in 1966-67 for the organization of yet another innovative college in which nearly 500 students would receive a first-rate program of general education. But administrative contacts insisted that the idea could succeed only if it were lodged in the minds of key faculty leaders who would shepherd it through the academic senate.

And these administrators emphasized not only that campus political realities were such that an administrator's success was contingent on his ability to subordinate himself to faculty, or at least appear to, but that they also sincerely favored a strong senate and were happy to be regarded as the facilitators of faculty policy.

A former chancellor was credited in administrative conversations with bringing students into participation in policy formulation at U-I. But, while agreeing that a start had been made toward innovations in this area, there was no agreement on the roles students could or should currently play. Some spokesmen felt that students were apathetic toward educational reform, at least in 1966-67, and that there had not been a significant number of students involved in activist programs, political, social, or educational. These administrators tended to insist that the earlier efforts had not been successful and that it had failed because students were not qualified for involvement in academic policy formulation. Other administrators, and they tended to be at a lower rank comparatively, were optimistic about student abilities and felt that what had been started was still an important influence and certainly a harbinger of things to come. At most of the colleges and universities of the study, those administrators more removed from student contact by the nature of their jobs were less likely to urge student involvement in governance than were those administrators working actively with students. Here is one area of life where familiarity, if that means human contacts, does not breed contempt.

The independent and off-campus housing arrangement, a unique dimension of life on this campus, where approximately one-third of the U-I students live, was seen by some administrative interviewees as an "albatross" to the academic aspirations of the campus. The dynamics of the situation in the special housing area were said to be anti-intellectual. This off-campus concentration of students has no direct counterpart at other campuses of this university and this situation was seen by several interviewees as contributing to the rather widespread "fun and games" image of this campus. One of the innovations at U-I has been the attempt to introduce an academic dimension into the off-campus housing milieu by getting the financers of a high-rise complex of dorms to include 1500 square feet in these facilities for academic utilization.

Other efforts to combat the "fun and games" image of the campus included an academically centered orientation for entering freshmen, that is, faculty lecturing on substantive topics and working with fraternities and sororities to improve the academic influences on campus. The development of the "Greeks" at U-I in recent years was defended by one administrator because of the willingness of these "houses" to contribute to the academic development of their members. And, finally, an academic ethos was being encouraged by arranging visits to faculty homes, setting up student-faculty discussions on campus, and trying to bring certain faculty into residence on campus. These are all modest innovations compared to what is happening at some colleges and universities. With the exception of the college for creative students, the faculty at U-I has not shown much interest in innovation and the administration has given most of its energies to the establishment of conventional graduate programs.

U-H

The U-H campus of UniWestern has been, from its opening in 1965, self-consciously innovative. The publications have emphasized this intention, and administrators interviewed stressed it. Certain interviewees stated that they shunned the use of the word "experimental" because of its tentative and unsettling connotations, but everybody agreed that U-H had been organized to innovate. The pass-fail grading system instituted by the first of their colleges, U-H_1, was often mentioned as illustrative of the audacity of the innovations proposed or underway. The very organization of the colleges, each with a character of its own, was probably the most frequently mentioned indication of innovation.

When the goals or aims of the U-H campus were examined, researchers were impressed by the lack of change rhetoric or radical statements. One administrator who was queried on this point replied that the educational objectives of U-H were not particularly different, nor more radical, than those in better institutions of higher education across the nation. But, he said, U-H had an opportunity to achieve these objectives to a degree not characteristic of other colleges and universities. The opportunity to start afresh and the shared resolve of faculty and administrators, it was said, would be decisive. U-H had a great opportunity to attain established goals by new means. U-H, by the definitions of this study, was interested in innovation, not experimentation.

Most of the ten administrators contacted did not care to speculate on how radical the campus might become. Visitors got the impression, even as one administrator said, that the issue had not been joined, that the possibilities had not been tested. Only one provost, at the time of the study, had shown any radical academic inclinations and, given the determination of the chief campus administrators to hire as provosts only men of established national reputation, it was unlikely that the situation would change. Later leadership would be limited in some measure by precedents set by predecessors. However, one key administrator insisted that leadership at the faculty level and in administration could be found that would combine interest in research and teaching, in tradition and change. He said, "So long as we can get both talents, why settle for one?" Another administrator argued that, contrary to the widespread notion that a college is never more innovative than the day it opens and that almost every subsequent change in a new college can be expected to be back toward tradition and familiar patterns, the creative capabilities of faculty and administration at U-H may have been dulled by the sheer necessity of "getting the show on the road," by organizing classes and colleges. Therefore, by this thesis, the present status of the colleges should not be regarded as representative of potentialities or, necessarily, of future probabilities. The faculty might give more time to their classes later on, said this leader, after the organizational committee work is done, and then they may turn out some radically different programs.

However, yet another administrator said that it should surprise no one that course titles at U-H were conventional or that the academic programs of the colleges were developing along conventional lines. Nothing different could or should be expected. All faculties these days are professionally oriented and may be expected to organize their work accordingly;

there was no possibility that U-H or any other campus could act independent of the traditions and procedures existing among academics.

It was surprising to the project staff that the philosophy or educational objectives of U-H were nowhere stated directly. The integrative values, the tacit assumptions, the ultimate basis for authority and for community--these matters were not discussed in the literature. The viability of the university in its institutional forms, with its subject matter disciplines, hierarchical organization, and middle class value orientation, appeared to be assumed. In various ways the shared aims of the colleges were indicated to be:

- to ignite curiosity
- to increase knowledge, and with it understanding of the significance, methods, interrelations, and inadequacies of our various ways of looking at the universe
- to cultivate the skills involved in inquiry, expression, and the handling of ideas
- to teach habits of honesty, accuracy, sensitivity, and independence
- to enlarge the student's understanding of his own and other cultures; to develop the student's ability to stand outside himself, to understand as a consequence his location and opportunities
- to foster a sense of competence in the academic area by encouraging some expertness.

And these aims were more seriously pondered at U-H, in the judgment of the researchers, than at most colleges and universities. Nevertheless, the project staff wondered if enough attention was being given, in the formative years, to the meanings that would be assigned, in a time of great change, when traditional definitions can no longer be assumed to be accepted, to time-honored expressions like "liberal education," to words such as "honesty" and "independence." The pressures to get on with the quantitative task, the immense job of launching a college a year, seemed so great that already one of the core administrators lamented the fact that he felt shy of time for the theoretical conceptualizations of long-range planning. Another administrator, when asked how the assumptions, values, and goals of U-H had been communicated to him, replied that he had no memory of explicit conversations or the presentation of printed statements on these matters. He had read the literature, watched, listened, tried to somehow "catch" what was not specifically taught. He wondered about the absence of a statement of objectives and tended to believe that there should be one. Maybe a formal statement of ideological commitments would be no more influential at U-H than it is most other places. Maybe such things have to be more nearly caught than taught. But, one way or another, they must be present if U-H is to have colleges of consequence.

The long-range Academic Plan for /U-H7, 1965-75, emphasized the creation of a physical environment that would provide a setting well suited for educational innovation. The challenge was to experiment with new methods of instruction, study, and communication and to build a campus that would be up to date in the twenty-first century. At the inaugural ceremonies, May 3, 1966, the campus chancellor called U-H an "experimental campus."

However, from the first, and perhaps increasingly over time, this forthright commitment to change has been qualified. The U-H campus was expected to adhere to statewide policies and procedures. The criteria for employment, at the level of both faculty and administration, have been largely conventional, seldom innovative. The same has been true regarding student admissions policies. The organization of administration has been conventional; a few new offices and titles were introduced, but most of the positions are those of the statewide system (e.g., assistant vice chancellor for humanities), and no serious challenge to the university's hierarchical organization has been raised. As one administrator put it, in correspondence with project staff:

> Because this campus is launched within [UniWestern], we must accept as 'given' many things that come along with that context: provisions of the state constitution and laws, definition of roles in the Master Plan, regental by-laws, regulations of the Academic Senate, and at least a modicum of customs and traditions. In exchange we get financial support, a share of the general endowment, instant accreditation, assumed equality standards.

And this leader concluded, showing a determination to combine the old and the new:

> I think the price is not too much to pay, and I think the terms of reference permit both innovation and experimentation.

Two other administrators interviewed did not want to be regarded as innovators because they professed to have no particular interest in innovation. What they wanted was a rigorous intellectual experience for U-H students, not "gimmickry." If transferring the superficiality of much of America's higher education into something intellectually rigorous was innovative, then, of course, they were happy to be called innovators.

Two or three administrative officers were quite willing to allow radical innovations in one college but were not eager to have other and later colleges obligated to adhere to the same emphases. These discussions were held, obviously, in relation to the issue of the transfer of the $U\text{-}H_1$ pass-fail grading arrangement to $U\text{-}H_2$. These administrators were concerned lest the image of the total university campus become identified with an innovation in one of its colleges. They thought it possible that the faculties of later colleges might not want to take up this rather radical innovation. There has been, in fact, since the time of the study, a modification in policy to allow the faculty boards of studies to decide the grading procedure to be used in the courses under their authority.

The incident used here to illustrate how the commitment of this campus of UniWestern to innovation and experimentation was being qualified might suggest that such adjustments were all toward conventional academic values and arrangements. This is, in fact, what most often happens, despite the insistence of the U-H administration that the faculty there may become more radical as they settle and get in stride. However, it must be acknowledged that the administrators who were resisting the imposition of pass-fail grading on all colleges may have been primarily concerned to preserve freedom for other colleges to innovate in their own way and even in ways more radical than those devised by the early planners.

Experiences with other avowedly innovative colleges in the study and data gathered from other studies suggest that after five to seven years innovative colleges reach a critical period when the rationale that motivated the pioneers is no longer evident and the expectations of newcomers, both faculty and students, may vary. The consequence is factionalism within the community, usually resulting in the separation of "traditionalists" and "innovators," and threatening stagnation as further changes become difficult to achieve. With the loss of a sense of community, attention is focused on whatever subcultures emerge or on various expressions of individualism. It is at this stage of development, perhaps even more than at the outset of the program, that strong leadership is needed. The contending forces in these innovative colleges tend to balance each other off, the attendant sense of frustration causes withdrawal, and, therefore, a "third force" is needed to reconcile factions, to point a direction and get things moving again. It is crucial that this third force, be it from administration or a coterie including representation from administration, faculty, and the student body, have a sense of purpose and be willing to provide leadership.

At U-H, the central administrators, particularly the chancellor, have shown a remarkable consistency of purpose. The campus would be innovative, they said, and the collegiate emphasis, the opportunity for independent study, the pass-fail grading arrangement, were all expressions of that commitment. The campus would also be firmly established in the UniWestern system, and the supremacy of the conventional standard of excellence was proof of that commitment.

In the opinion of administration contacts, the innovative nature of the campus has not hurt student or faculty recruitment. The campus had five student candidates for every opening in the colleges at the time of the study and administrators were deluged with faculty applicants. Some students at U-H, visitors were told, might feel that the faculty had not taken advantage of the opportunities for innovation, while some faculty might find certain aspects of the U-H program too innovative for their taste, but, by and large, the U-H way was to be different without being radical.

The "middle path" of U-H was vividly illustrated in 1966-67 by a campus controversy over student social regulations, dress rules, and the like. Students noticed that the administration seemed to think that students had sufficient self-discipline academically to engage in independent study, and, indeed, this was an innovation featured by the campus publications, but that there was no parallel delegation of responsibility concerning personal and social matters. Students thought that they were being set free academically but circumscribed socially. Administrators, however, refused to yield to student pressure for the individualization of student behavior patterns. They argued that just as academic standards would prevail at U-H, so there would be social standards. The achievement of community required shared commitments, and the university, not the individual, would finally decide the basic nature of that community. Administrators, it seemed, saw themselves as the representatives of the university's values. The university had definite academic values--it did not hesitate to discriminate academically, for example--but, socially, the university was less definite, less certain of its values. Thus, U-H administrators had little reason to believe that there was a consensus of opinion in the university as to what constitutes good taste and moral behavior. But in arrogating to themselves the right of judgment, they may have been putting the university's signature to their own values.

In several of the administrative interviews, on the other campuses as well as at U-H, the disappointment of adults with current student values was evident. Administrators at U-H stated that the achievement of a spirit of community or a sense of a shared enterprise was basic to the success of all else, but that students today were so highly individualistic, even anarchistic, that it was really impossible to establish the unity of purpose and the collective involvement of all parties in the total program for which the first planners had hoped, Also, they were somewhat dismayed by the personal styles of students. Several administrators were "Anglophiles" and they were a little wry about the lack of social graces and basic courtesies in the behavior of some students. It was clear that, in the opinion of these planners, U-H students were more experimental in their personal behavior than was desired or expected for this innovative campus.

The prospects for substantive student participation in academic governance at U-H have been hurt because the students, at least a conspicuous minority of them, have been sufficiently variant in their personal behavior patterns to both disappoint and confuse certain administrators. These administrators would have been happy to involve students in planning, at least in advisory capacities, perhaps as voting participants in policy formulation, had the students given evidence of being firmly committed to the social and ethical values of the educated adult society. But when so many of the youth became critical of societal values, including the values of the chief agent of socialization, the school, administrative leaders at U-H, at least in 1966-67, seemed more determined than they would otherwise have been to retain the conventional, hierarchical organization of the institution. One evidence of reaction was seen in the considerable modification in provisions for student government at U-H_2 as compared to the first college, U-H_1. With the burst of enthusiasm, energy and idealism that usually accompanies new beginnings, the U-H_1 administration had left the organization of student government in the hands of students. Starting with the U-H_1 Assembly, a rather pure form of community government, the students spent most of the first year, in the opinion of some administrators, oscillating between anarchy and oligarchy. When U-H_2 opened things were different. Entering students were presented with a provisional form of student government, worked out by the provost and a committee of junior college transfer students. Thus, at least for most of the first year, under this plan, U-H_2 would have a structural provision for orderly government and the more traditional form of student government would get a head start.

The implication in this variation in the way student government at the two colleges was launched is that the more experimental, open model proved threatening to the essentially conventional values of the university's chief administrators and the conclusion was reached, therefore, that more adult leadership was needed in shaping student government at U-H_2. Innovation was welcome, but not experimentation. However, in 1966-67, U-H_1 emerged with a sense of community that, everyone agreed, was much more noticeable than U-H_2's.

Many explanations have been offered to explain the greater measure of success at the point of collegiality in the first college, compared to the second. Some emphasized that the architecture of U-H_2 had an opposite effect to that of U-H_1. Whereas the U-H_1 buildings were grouped closely and thus created a centripetal effect encouraging the spirit of community, the somewhat more sprawling layout of buildings at U-H_2 had a centrifugal effect. This viewpoint is especially interesting in view of the fact that the buildings of West-F, at West University, which also were tightly grouped in quadrangle fashion, were though by students and faculty there to offer much too closed a stance, to be so centripetal as to necessitate measures that would encourage centrifugal influences, to somehow open and relax the atmosphere of the college.

Another explanation of why U-H_2 had not become unified and was called the "cafeteria college" was that nearly half of their first student class had transferred from U-H_1 and were either sorry to have left the U-H_1 community or were hostile toward U-H_1--either way, their attention was not easily centered on U-H_2. A third factor, it was said, involved the personality and style of leadership in the colleges. The provost at U-H_1 was a charismatic leader.

While granting the significance of all these influences, project staff wondered if the early attempt to establish community government at U-H_1, with all of the fumbling hesitation and confusion that attended the effort, was not another important factor in the creation of a noteworthy sense of unity in that college. This explanation was not heard in 1966-67. U-H_2, after all, was in its first year. But, on the basis of later visits to the campus, researchers are prepared to make the claim that the early experimental efforts at U-H_1, which at the time seemed threatening to the ideals of the campus, were in fact more consistent with those ideals than other, later modifications which, as it worked out, tended to threaten the collegial spirit in the name of order.

Other evidence that the students at the U-H colleges may have contributions to make in governance, if the campus is to be innovative, will come out in the review of data from the student questionnaire. One other incident, a report of which came from administrative interviews, will be mentioned here as another measure of student interest in change and their willingness personally to accept the risks involved in it.

The pass-fail grading plan, a controversial innovation from the outset, but especially since the action of the academic senate in the first year of organization seemed to impose it on all colleges, was modified in 1967 to permit the boards of studies to decide whether, in their areas of academic responsibility, the pass-fail arrangement or conventional letter grades would be used. The board of study controlling courses in government and political science voted to use letter grades--to protect, the faculty said, the student's transfer and graduate school standing. But students enrolled for courses in this "department" appealed to the faculty to change its action. They argued that the faculty's caution threatened the innovative nature of the U-H campus by compromising one of its most distinctive innovations and, as for the risks to the students' future, the students declared their willingness to bear that themselves.

This development is akin to one at West-F where, under student encouragment, the three-point grading scale which had been introduced as a modification of the conventional five-point grading formula when the college opened was changed to "satisfactory"/"unsatisfactory." Here, again, student action helped to assure the full thrust of an innovation.

The final area of innovation that shall be mentioned before turning to faculty and student perspectives on related themes, deals with innovations in the organization of this campus. It has been implied elsewhere in this report that one of the ways to test the commitment of administrators to change is to propose innovation in the administrative structure of the institution, in the positions, titles, job descriptions, and other definitions by which they derive their authority and security, and by which the authority structure of the campus is defined. Applying this test to the U-H campus reveals the ambivalence of the situation there, the mixture of old and new, tradition and innovation. However, the U-H campus had done more at the time of this study than any other participant institution and more than almost any other major college or university in the country to innovate toward new administrative configurations.

The U-H plan had its warp and woof. The colleges represent the warp. Faculty are associated with one or another of the colleges. Each college has a provost, whose job it is to establish the college as an entity with a sense of purpose and community. This university campus is, however, also organized into three major subject matter divisions--natural sciences, social sciences, humanities--and this feature is the woof of the organizational fabric. A vice chancellor heads each of these divisions, and faculty are all identified with one division even as they are with a college. There are, within divisions, the boards of studies, each with a convener. These boards serve as surrogate departments, with the convener a chairman-equivalent. Boards and divisions protect the subject matter specialization of faculty. Thus, at U-H, an innovative organizational mesh accommodates traditional arrangements--but in a loose weave, and with the design changed. The colleges were established first, given a start, before the divisions got underway. The colleges have been given a chance to establish their identity and win the loyalty of faculty and students. U-H is committed to the collegiate plan.

But, of course, professional rewards and sanctions in twentieth century American higher education have been tied to teaching, research, and publications within departments and by specializations. U-H has not been willing to break with that tradition. Therefore, the boards of studies and the divisions seem likely to eventually win out, despite the head start given the colleges. U-H faculty live now in a house with two doors and they have been moving freely through the collegial, innovative door as well as the divisional, traditional door. The provosts stand at one, the vice chancellors at the other. Provosts were the key leaders in academic matters in 1966-67, but since that time the vice chancellors have been appointed and are now getting to work. The title given the guardians of the university's traditional academic concerns is well known, the title of provost is new, ill-defined, untested. The academic senate regards provosts as something like deans, but they have neither legal nor traditional authority. They succeed by their wits.

In the early days of campus planning, the ambiguity of the provost's position in the hierarchy was probably an advantage. Free of the delimitations of regular job descriptions, the provost could provide leadership in a situation where faculty and administrators were just gathering strength and were sufficiently unsure of themselves to extend "senatorial courtesy" to anybody who seemed to know what he was doing. It is not difficult to foresee a day when the U-H division of UniWestern's academic senate--and, so far as could be determined, no serious effort was made in the beginning days to block the formation of the senate at U-H--will become so strongly established, and so much aware of its connection and continuity with the other university campuses, that the leadership of provosts in the academic realm will be ended. Provosts will become lackeys of the faculty, carrying out routine and ceremonial duties. Under such conditions, strong, able persons may be impossible to find for this position and one can predict that the innovative intentions of the collegial plan will be at the mercy of the divisions and the senate, bodies not likely to be advocates of change. Project staff think, and this idea was also stated by several administrators, that the position of the provost in the U-H scheme of things must be determined soon and not left exclusively to the judgment of time. It is true that the dignity and authority of the position has already been certified by chief administrators, but a clearer definition of the role is needed from the academic senate. And, of course, this is precisely the area where administrators think they have a little influence.

Faculty now have divided loyalty--to the college and to the senate. They cannot be advanced through the academic ranks without the approval of the provosts, and that provision by the chancellor was meant to assure the faculty person's active participation in the college. But it is also true that the faculty member cannot be advanced in UniWestern except by success as measured by conventional criteria of excellence. The colleges are at a disadvantage if the faculty person discovers he does not have time to give to activities that advance the interests of the college, such as involvement with students or the implementation and refinement of college innovations and, at the same time, to activities such as research and publications that advance him in his guild. The college is local, the guild is national. Faculty are likely to think one way when sitting as the governing body of a college and another way when sitting as the U-H division of the academic senate, because the emphases are different and perhaps irreconcilable.

U-H, despite all these qualifications and cautions, was mixing organizational innovation and conventional arrangements to a degree not found elsewhere in this study (1966-67). Despite the formidable problems associated with their efforts, including the threat of failure, the efforts of U-H to be an innovative campus contributed significantly to the fact that both students and faculty there were noticeably different from all other samples in the study. Something significant was happening at U-H, something that seemed to affect students, faculty, and administrators there sufficiently to create on that campus what we have called institutional distinctiveness.

DATA REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

Thus far this report has presented developments at four campuses of UniWestern that relate to the three foci of this study: philosophy of education and institutional objectives, the conventional criteria of institutional excellence, and innovation and experimentation--at least as these developments were understood by the research team through study of university publications and from interviews with administrators on the several campuses. Attention is directed now to data drawn from the faculty questionnaire and the student questionnaire given to persons on the participating campuses in order to bring faculty and student perspectives to bear on the themes of the project.

One of the several items in the faculty questionnaire used to elicit the impressions of respondents toward the general assumptions, values and goals of the institution read:

FQ5 What proportion of the present faculty do you consider to be seriously concerned, pro or con, with the formal institutional purposes that are intended to give direction and character to your college?

UniWestern respondents on the four campuses arranged themselves in the several response options and are compared to the CIT as follows:

%

	U-G (N=152)	$U-J_1$ (N=14)	U-I (N=94)	$U-H_1$ (N=14)	$U-H_2$ (N=16)	CIT (N=577)
Almost all	13	43	7	57	50	19
Well over half	24	21	24	43	38	26
About half	26	14	27	0	6	26
One-fourth or so	15	0	22	0	6	14
Very few	9	14	10	0	0	7
Such things are not the concern of the faculty	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	11	7	10	0	0	6

These data show that faculty at the older campuses of Uniwestern fall below the CIT responses, while faculty at the new campuses stand far above. Readers of this report will attach varying importance to having faculty seriously concerned about the formal institutional purposes that are supposed to give a college direction and character, but there can be little doubt that faculty samples on these campuses viewed their colleges quite differently. Some argue that the excitement of new beginning alone, not greater seriousness of purpose or philosophical sophistication, explain the greater attention to institutional objectives on the new campuses. But, if so, is this not an argument for new beginnings, for new campuses or the reshaping of old ones, if that development brings participants to think about the nature and worth of shared values?

Another question brought this subject to the respondent in a more direct and personal way:

FQ1 When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the task for which you were being considered?

Then four options were presented, and the faculty samples on the Uni-Western campuses responded as listed:

	%					
	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_1	U-H_2	CIT
Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed, at greater length than the particulars of the job.	4	36	4	79	69	16
About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job descriptions.	13	36	19	21	19	22
The institutional philosophy and educational purposes were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.	15	0	17	0	6	15
The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would relate thereto.	60	7	51	0	6	40
No response	8	21	7	0	0	7

It is evident once again that the new U-J and U-H campuses, at this early point in their formation, were giving much more attention to institutional ideology than was true at the older campuses of U-G and U-I. The older places showed the same trend toward departmental concentration as found in the composite institutional totals. The interest in institutional objectives at U-J_1 may be the most remarkable of the samples, given the graduate orientation of the faculty there and the national tendency for graduate faculty to be highly specialized.

Two items in the questionnaire distributed to freshman classes in the fall of 1966 help show student perspectives, at entrance to college, on the matters under discussion. Students were asked to indicate whether they thought they knew a lot about the general philosophy of the college they were entering, or a little, or nothing. Responses from UniWestern samples ran as indicated by numbers and percentages below:

%

SQ46	U-G (N=1523)	U-J_1 (N=480)	U-I (N=2676)	U-H_2* (N=213)
Know a lot about it	20	40	12	61
Know a little about it	69	52	70	36
Don't know anything about it	10	4	15	1
No response	1	3	3	2

Another question asked the student to indicate the most important objective and the second most important objective he had in coming to the college. Five response options were available and the following table shows the distribution in percentages of the student responses to this question:

%

SQ2	U-G		U-J_1		U-I		U-H_2	
	Most	Next	Most	Next	Most	Next	Most	Next
(1) To master certain techniques applicable to my vocation or field of special interest	49	19	48	24	40	19	24	24
(2) To acquire and use the skills and habits involved in critical and constructive thinking	22	21	28	21	25	20	38	26
(3) To attain a satisfactory emotional and social adjustment	5	18	4	14	8	22	10	15

-continued-

---

*U-H_2 is the only college on this campus within which student data for this study was secured.

%

	U-G		U-J_1		U-I		U-H_2	
	Most	**Next**	**Most**	**Next**	**Most**	**Next**	**Most**	**Next**
(4) To develop a broad general outlook and familiarity with a variety of subjects	18	28	17	31	22	27	27	31
(5) To acquire knowledge and attitudes basic to a satisfactory family life	5	12	2	7	4	9	1	3
No response	1	2	1	3	1	3	0	1

These data suggest that in 1966 entering students at U-G, U-I and U-J_1 were considerably more vocationally oriented than were those at U-H_2. Options 2 and 4 above, dealing with critical thinking and a broad outlook, are the two responses that best represent the traditional liberal arts ideal, and data from both indicate that this ideal had somewhat stronger appeal among the freshmen at U-H_2 than at the other campuses.

When faculty at project schools were given a group of frequently heard educational objectives and asked to give rank preferences according to their own view of what education should try to accomplish, they sided decisively at all four campuses with options 3 and 5, the ones in the following list that best express the liberal arts ideal:

%

FQ11

	U-G		U-J_1		U-I		U-H_1		U-H_2	
	Most	**Next**	**Most**	**Next**	**Most**	**Next**	**Most**	**Next**	**Most**	**Next**
(1) Preparation for vocation or profession	11	18	7	21	13	16	0	0	0	6
(2) Provision of knowledge, facts and information	8	14	20	7	6	19	0	14	6	6

-continued-

%

	U-G		U-J_1		U-I		U-H_1		U-H_2	
	Most	Next	Most	Next	Most	Next	Most	Next	Most	Next
(3) Development of the ability of the person to think and to understand the consequences of his actions	61	11	60	0	57	10	71	0	38	12
(4) Education for character	1	3	7	0	6	3	0	0	6	0
(5) Development of individual capacity for good judgment	11	28	0	29	7	26	0	50	12	25
(6) Training for citizenship	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
No response	3	16	0	29	6	24	29	36	25	38

Also worth noting is the fact that the segments of faculty vocationally oriented (option 1) or those who favor what might be called the multiversity mentality (option 2), while proportionately small on both items, nevertheless were noticeably larger at the older campuses than at the newer campuses of UniWestern.

But the most important detail in these results is the considerable gap shown by these data--FQ11, and the preceding table, SQ2--between student and faculty expectations for the educational experience. That there is a gap is not surprising, but that 40% to 50% of the freshmen at U-G, U-I and U-J listed vocational training and specialization as their first objective, while less than 15% of the faculties on these same campuses shared these emphases, is surprising. Whereas only 20% to 30% of the students at these schools sided first with the critical thinking and broad outlook goals, about 60% of the faculties declared their first preference to be a goal akin to critical thinking. This difference in perspective and level of expectation seems to us to be considerable and suggests that work needs to be done with parents, high school counsellors, and youth at the secondary level to notify them of the primary objectives of the collegiate educational experience and, of course, to try to persuade them to accept these aims. That a better congruence is possible between participant groups in the learning experience is suggested by the data showing that at U-H the gap had been closed considerably and that students and faculty there were more nearly unified in the ideals of the liberal arts.

Some readers may point out that U-G and U-I have a large number of professional and preprofessional students--in agriculture, engineering, education, and business administration--who give heavily vocational responses. When U-H starts programs of this sort and gets such students, the argument runs, it will show responses more like the other schools. The position of the research staff is that the overwhelming popularity of U-H with student applicants--they lead the UniWestern campuses in declarations of student preference--suggests that while many of the entering students there may have been in their earlier years as vocationally oriented as applicants at U-G, U-I and elsewhere, the comparatively straightforward commitment of the U-H literature to the liberal arts ideal, as compared to "all things to all men" pronouncements of other places, has led student applicants to an anticipatory identification with the educational ideal that they associate with U-H--the place they want to attend.

Before leaving a review of items in the faculty and student testing instruments that show respondents' views on institutional objectives and educational philosophies, findings from a question given to faculty samples will be reported that indicate their attitudes toward changes affecting the basic stance of the institution of higher education in the larger societal setting. In a question calling for the personal view of the respondent on certain ideas about higher education in the context of change, the following three items were included:

FQ15 Colleges and universities, as institutions, must assume a larger, more important role in setting the goals and programs of our society.

%

	U-G	U-J$_1$	U-I	U-H$_1$	U-H$_2$	CIT
Strongly agree	26	36	21	29	38	27
Agree	43	36	48	43	31	44
Can't say	9	0	7	14	6	8
Disagree	16	7	18	14	6	15
Strongly disagree	3	0	2	0	0	2
No response	1	14	1	0	6	2

A second entry in this question read:

Radical technological changes in our society necessitate radical changes in the educational experiences offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different.

%

	U-G	U-J$_1$	U-I	U-H$_1$	U-H$_2$	CIT
Strongly agree	17	14	16	14	31	19
Agree	43	21	33	43	38	40
Can't say	8	36	11	36	6	11
Disagree	20	21	29	7	19	20
Strongly disagree	5	0	3	0	0	3
No response	1	7	1	0	0	1

The third item concerning the relationship of colleges with society read as follows:

> Course work should be more relevant to the social and political realities in the world outside the campus.

	%					
	U-G	U-J$_1$	U-I	U-H$_1$	U-H$_2$	CIT
Strongly agree	11	14	7	21	0	12
Agree	31	21	34	36	56	36
Can't say	17	0	10	7	19	13
Disagree	32	36	40	36	19	28
Strongly disagree	3	0	0	0	0	3
No response	1	14	1	0	0	1
Variant responses*	6	14	8	0	6	6

Inspection of the three preceding tables shows that well over 60% of the faculty respondents thought that colleges and universities should play a more important role in setting the goals and programs of society. Support for this proposition was greatest at U-H. Faculty were somewhat less enthusiastic about, but still generally supportive of, the notion that technology today necessitates radical changes in the educational experience of modern youth, but they definitely hesitated and were quite divided over the proposal that course work should be more relevant to social and political realities. It can be seen under "Variant responses," a category usually not shown because of its monotonously small offering, that this question drew a lot of fire. Perhaps faculty think that course work is already sufficiently relevant, but why, if so, do they support

---

*Qualification, objections to form and content, and other marginal comments unsuitable to coding categories.

"radical change" in the educational experience of youth as a response to technological change? Despite all the nuances of meaning that are possible in the preceding statements, and all the variables involved in the populations considering them, the conclusion of project personnel was that respondents were more willing to have the institution of higher education change society than they were interested in changing the institution in response to society's needs. But this was 1966-67, and an openness to change by faculty, especially regarding the nature of educational institutions in contemporary society (an openness that according to these data was beginning to be evident, though still qualified and hesitant), has grown considerably since that time as the magnitude of social and economic problems has become better known.

Some of the hesitation about the propositions of this question--the comparatively large "Can't say" contingent at some campuses, for example--was due to an identification by some respondents with the liberal arts tradition, understood as an ideal and as activities that should properly stand apart from the pressures of time and place. Recently, however, some authorities claim, faculty have been coming to see that the ideal's best features need not be sacrificed by efforts to involve it in social and political realities. In this study such a change in stance may be perceived, one reflected in these data, particularly in the reports from newer campuses, a change toward greater participation by the institution of higher education in the formulation and implementation of values and objectives for the general culture of the society because of a change toward greater self-consciousness about the basic values and objectives of the institution of higher education itself.

It does not follow from the preceding statement that data support the claim of substantive diversity at the level of values among faculties and students on the campuses of UniWestern or elsewhere. There is, on the contrary, almost complete conformity to the conventional criteria of excellence. This is so with both faculty and students, though less so with students than with faculty. The students at the new colleges of the U-H campus, as will be shown soon, were an exception to the above generalization. They were, at entrance into college in 1966, a different breed of cat.

Faculty responses to certain items in the questionnaire indicate their professional orientation. Included in the questions dealing with features of academic life that have varying degrees of importance for contemporary faculty were these three specific concerns: availability of research money and facilities, research and writing, and teaching in the area of academic specialization. Faculty on the UniWestern campuses graded themselves and their peers as follows:

FQ2 Availability of research money and facilities.

%

	U-G	U-J$_1$	U-I	U-H$_1$	U-H$_2$	CIT
Self						
Very important	70	21	58	50	31	51
Somewhat important	24	57	37	43	62	38
Not important	3	14	4	7	6	9
Others						
Very important	76	79	66	64	31	51
Somewhat important	13	14	28	29	50	34
Not important	1	0	2	0	0	6

FQ12 Research and writing.

%

	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_1	U-H_2	CIT
Self						
Very important	77	100	76	79	81	66
Somewhat important	20	0	16	21	12	27
Not important	1	0	6	0	0	5
Others						
Very important	71	71	70	64	50	48
Somewhat important	18	14	17	21	31	36
Not important	1	0	4	0	0	6

FQ12 Teaching in the area of academic specialization.

%

	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_1	U-H_2	CIT
Self						
Very important	87	86	85	79	81	83
Somewhat important	11	14	11	21	19	15
Not important	1	0	3	0	0	1
Others						
Very important	68	64	71	86	75	72
Somewhat important	20	14	19	0	6	17
Not important	1	7	2	0	0	2

The attention of the reader is called to an interesting difference or discrepancy between certain U-J_1 data. Only 21% of the faculty sample there rate "availability of research money and facilities" as "Very important," but 100% rate research and writing as "Very important" for themselves. If this faculty were heavily weighted with humanities professors, who need relatively little in the way of money or research facilities, the difference would be understandable. But the U-J faculty is heavily skewed towards scientists, who need such things. This fact, coupled with the report that only 21% of that faculty rate research money and facilities as "Very important," and set over against the fact that the U-J faculty have gotten more research money per person than any institution in the nation, suggests the conclusion that faculty members are likely to rate high not what they have and value but what they don't have, yet value.

U-J, the literature said, was a campus that proposed to challenge every assumption of higher education. If a "professionally oriented faculty," one emphasizing research and publication and teaching specializations, was one of those assumptions that was to be challenged, these data indicate that it had not been challenged sufficiently to make a noticeable difference in the values of the U-J faculty, or, though challenged, it had survived the challenge and defeated it. The U-J faculty show themselves fully committed to at least these dimensions of the conventional criteria. And the other campuses of UniWestern are no different. It should be noticed that the U-H faculty modify the intensity of commitment to research and writing a little, but they are not remarkably different on these scales from their colleagues elsewhere. This has an ominous note for those who are pulling there for a victory by the new colleges over the subject-matter divisions, to the end of reducing the pressures of research and publication and increasing the possibilities of closer, more vital faculty-student relationships.

The conventional standard of institutional excellence affects student values even as it affects faculty and administrators. But the entering freshmen at U-H_2 and at other new colleges in this study showed some willingness to break with the lock-step conformity to which, in the judgment of project staff, professionalism has brought almost all colleges and universities. The following section of the report is intended to reveal student attitudes toward certain dimensions of the professional criteria for success, and especially to emphasize that while there was very little difference among the faculties on the participating campuses of the university at the point of fidelity to these conventional criteria, there were conspicuous differences between student groups.

The following table gives the responses (in percentages) of students to a question intended to elicit their attitudes toward grade competition:

SQ30 How do you feel about competing with other students for grades and recognition?

	%			
	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_2
I dislike it very much and prefer to avoid it.	14	13	11	26
I dislike it somewhat.	29	23	25	22
I have neutral feelings about this.	17	14	20	13
I like it somewhat.	32	33	33	30
I like it very much.	7	14	11	7

The proportion of students who claimed to be at ease with grade competition remains constant on all four campuses. But the proportion disliking grades intensely is constant on only three campuses--the U-H_2 freshmen were different to a noticeable degree.

At another point in the questionnaire, student respondents were asked to choose between paired features those they would associate with an ideal college. Three of the items in the list of college characteristics relate to grading procedures:

SQ47

	% U-G	% U-J_1	% U-I	% U-H_2
Much competitiveness for grades and recognition	32	44	41	16
versus				
Little competitiveness for grades and recognition.	66	52	54	82
Students selected mostly on grades and admission scores	58	65	61	43
versus				
Students selected mostly on personal qualities.	39	30	34	54
Courses given letter grades (A,B,C,D,F)	36	47	50	12
versus				
Courses graded "pass" or "fail."	62	50	45	85

The freshman class of 1966 at U-J_1 was much more like the freshmen entering U-G and U-I that fall, in attitudes toward conventional grading, than they were like the students entering U-H_2. U-H_2 freshmen were markedly less interested in competition for grades, while they were somewhat more interested in innovative admissions criteria and very much more interested in an innovative grading standard. U-H_2, it seems, had succeeded in 1966 in establishing itself in the minds of students, and, presumably, with counsellors and parents as well, as an innovative campus. Consequently, it drew larger proportions of students who were receptive to changes of the sort described in the preceding tables than did U-J.

It should also be noted that at the campus coded U-G, an institution usually associated with conservative thinking, 62% of the freshmen stated a preference for "pass-fail" grading. However, their interest in this innovation was not sustained sufficiently in other items to justify a claim that entering students at U-G wanted the campus to be avowedly different. When freshmen were asked how important "an opportunity to participate in experimental educational programs" was to them in selecting the college they were entering, students responded as follows:

SQ45

	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_2
Important	4	16	5	59
Somewhat important	18	35	20	27
Not important or not applicable	77	45	72	13

It is clear from the above that U-J's more pronounced interest in innovation had affected a larger proportion of entering freshmen than was the case at U-G or U-I. It is also seen, however, that U-J students are closer to U-G and U-I on this scale than to the other avowedly innovative campus, U-H. The image of innovation had affected students entering U-H_2 in a measure that sets it apart.

On the question already referred to, in which the respondent is asked to declare characteristics he associates with an ideal college by choosing between paired choices, two items in addition to those reported in the earlier tables reveal student attitudes toward change and innovation.

		%			
		U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_2
SQ47	College traditional in most respects	68	29	57	14
	versus				
	College experimental in most respects	30	66	38	84
	Little emphasis on independent study	18	17	19	8
	versus				
	Much emphasis on independent study	80	79	77	91

It is evident once again that the students in the U-H sample unashamedly favored an "experimental" emphasis. Those at U-J were also inclined this way, but less noticeably so. The entering classes on the other two campuses stated a preference for a "traditional" college. So, whereas it could be said concerning the table on page IX-59 that findings there might not show that freshmen at U-G and U-I were personally opposed to an experimental educational program but only that they knew the campuses they were entering did not offer experimental programs, this latest table shows that in choosing their ideal college, the students at U-G and U-I declared a preference for one that is "traditional."

The findings on the second half of this table, the part dealing with independent study, suggest that freshmen think that it is possible to opt for a "traditional" college which emphasizes independent study. Elsewhere in this report an opportunity for independent study has been identified as one of the marks of an innovative or experimental college, but these data show that the entering students at U-G and U-I strongly favor independent study for their "ideal" college, although they also want one traditional in most respects. Maybe this feature would be one of the respects in which their ideal college would not be "traditional," for this feature is not often emphasized in the majority of American colleges and universities

Nevertheless, even though all the samples state a preference for independent study, the U-H students once again accept the innovative option by a larger proportion than is true of others.

Another "innovation" that drew strong support from freshmen in all four of the campuses of this study was a teaching and learning arrangement featuring group discussions rather than lecture classes. The student opinion on this matter was expressed in response to the question dealing with the design of an ideal college:

SQ47

	% U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_2
Mostly lecture classes	30	21	22	15
versus				
Mostly group discussion classes	68	76	73	83

Student at the newer campuses are most attracted to that approach to learning which is for this country the more innovative. Of greater interest, perhaps, is the broad support that group discussions, like independent study, received across campus lines. In the opinion of the researchers, the high level of receptiveness shown by students toward these innovations makes these ideas points at which advocates of change might begin work. This is especially true since both notions are calculated to increase student involvement in the learning process and, as a corollary, to personalize the learning experience. Independent study should have appeal for faculty who feel overburdened with student contact hours (it is assumed here that independent study means, or should mean, having students take the initiative while faculty act as resource persons), while discussion classes should have appeal for faculty who would like more direct, informal student contacts.

Student attitudes toward an innovative approach to curriculum design were also tested in this study. Respondents were offered two statements which represented an open versus a tutelary way of organizing the learning experience. "Which of these statements," the encompassing question began, "comes closer to your own view?"

SQ58

	%			
	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_2
Students should be given very great freedom in choosing their subjects of study and in choosing their areas of interest within these subjects.	57	32	52	66
There is a body of knowledge to be learned, and the faculty is more competent than the student to direct the student's course of study, through required courses, prerequisites and the like.	42	66	41	32

Student opinion here was quite divided. However, the considerable support for student freedom at the older campuses (Did they have in mind simply the elective system?), compared to the more submissive attitude at U-J, caused researchers to conclude that these data support the claim that U-J's entering freshmen in 1966 were considerably more orthodox academically than were U-H students. Here, as before, U-H leads the way in favoring the innovation option.

Turning from the forms of curriculum innovation and possible changes in pedagogy to look at the prospects for innovation and experimentation in institutional governance, project data show that students were evenly divided on the issue of their greater participation in academic policy formulation while faculty were generally opposed to greater student involvement in academic governance. The student questionnaire item read as follows:

SQ57 Should students participate significantly in the [selection of] content and organization of courses, academic policy decisions, and matters of this sort?

		%		
	U-G	U-J$_1$	U-I	U-H$_2$
Yes	46	42	45	56
No	8	12	8	9
Maybe	40	41	33	32
Don't know	6	4	8	3

U-J freshmen are least inclined to challenge traditional faculty hegemony in academic matters. Findings on both the preceding questions imply that these students have been affected by the reputation of the U-J campus as having a renowned, dominant faculty. And they seemed to accept this condition and its consequences. U-H freshmen, on the other hand, have the highest proportion favoring innovation in the authority structure of the institution and the lowest proportions in the "Don't know" and "No response" categories.

The faculty questionnaire item dealing with the subject of student participation in academic governance was more precisely worded than was the student question. The item in the faculty testing instrument and faculty responses from the UniWestern campuses were as follows:

FQ4 Should students at your college participate more than they do at present in the formulation and implementation of academic policies, i.e., in establishing the content and organization of courses, on academic policy committees, by student-formed and student-led seminars?

%

	U-G	U-J$_1$	U-I	U-H$_1$	U-H$_2$
Yes	30	21	23	29	38
No	64	64	73	64	44

This question, even more than most, must be evaluated contextually. Faculty responded in the context of the level of student involvement existent in 1966. However, at the time of the study students did not have formal voting representation on faculty committees making academic policies for UniWestern campuses. Students at certain campuses were on administrative committees, and both formal and informal mechanisms had been set up at several campuses to encourage better communication. But having made these allowances, it must be said that about two-thirds of the faculty samples were opposed to more substantive student participation. They were opposed, it seems, to anything more than having students serve in advisory, consultative capacities or, in some cases, opposed to more than ceremonial or token representation on academic committees. And in this stand they are at one with faculty colleagues in the other colleges and universities of the project. The CIT figures were "Yes," 34% and "No," 62%.

In another area of campus life faculty were more interested in change. Despite traditional college supervision of the social and personal lives of students, under the concept of in loco parentis, the majority in faculty samples indicated a preference for giving students more freedom and responsibility. The questionnaire item showing this result was a section of a general question reading, "Here are some ideas about higher education in the context of change. Check the category that best indicates your personal view on these matters." And the subsection read:

FQ15 The concept of _in loco parentis_ is unnecessary and undesirable because students should have the freedoms and responsibilities of adults.

	U-G	$U-J_1$	U-I	$U-H_1$	$U-H_2$	CIT
	%					
Strongly agree	17	14	15	29	19	15
Agree	33	36	44	29	56	38
Can't say	9	7	10	14	0	11
Disagree	25	7	20	21	6	25
Strongly disagree	7	0	3	0	0	3
No response	3	14	1	0	6	2
Variant responses	6	21	8	7	12	6

This table shows a slight majority of faculty siding with the notion that the concept of _in loco parentis_ ought to be changed because students should have the freedoms and responsibilities of adults. But, as the previous data show, faculty are more hesitant about bestowing freedom and responsibility on students in the academic realm. Apparently many faculty are not opposed to change, nor indeed to change in areas affecting the student's learning experience (numerous studies show that most of the student's learning takes place outside the classroom). However, they are opposed in greater numbers to changes in academic governance, to changes that would enlarge student freedom and responsibility by involving them as young adults in policy formulation.

Faculty, however, according to the data of this study, do favor some changes that would affect the academic life of their institutions. As a part of a question reading "Here are some prevalent opinions on the programs of American colleges and universities. Check the category that best indicates the applicability of each to your institution," respondents were given this statement:

FQ14 There should be less emphasis on grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements.

%

	U-G	U-J$_1$	U-I	U-H$_1$	U-H$_2$	CIT
Strongly agree	18	29	23	0	12	21
Agree	46	29	44	21	12	42
Can't say	3	0	7	0	6	6
Disagree	27	21	22	36	19	24
Strongly disagree	1	7	2	29	31	4
No response	1	14	0	0	0	1
Variant	3	0	1	14	19	3

Three of the four campuses, those characterized as the most conventional, sided with the need for change in their institutions. In this they were in agreement with the CIT. The data from U-H provided a surprise, at least at first glance. Faculty there did not put less emphasis on the conventional evaluative mechanisms mentioned in the question because, perhaps, they already had the pass-fail innovation in effect on that campus, plus other related innovations, and they thought things had gone far enough in the direction of such changes. These data may be of special relevance for U-H as a sign of the extent to which the pass-fail controversy on that campus during 1966-67 was in the minds of faculty and was, it seems, a source of considerable concern to them.

Recalling the sizable student support for changes in grading procedures, and the considerable number expressing dissatisfaction with existing arrangements, project personnel conclude that testing and grading is an area ripe for reform, one in which most faculty and students are concerned sufficiently to make them responsive to proposals for change.

At two points in the faculty testing instrument efforts were made to discover how faculty felt about specific forms of innovation. In each instance, respondents were asked to reply for themselves and for their colleagues on the importance of interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities and of cross-disciplinary teaching. The actual wording of the items and the responses by percentages follow:

FQ2 Interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities (in *your* institution)

				%		
	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_1	U-H_2	CIT
Self						
Very important	35	50	23	71	75	41
Somewhat important	51	43	55	29	19	45
Not important	13	7	21	0	6	13
Others						
Very important	9	29	6	14	25	17
Somewhat important	56	57	56	64	56	53
Not important	22	14	33	7	0	21

FQ12 Cross-disciplinary teaching (theoretical importance, as opposed to actual teaching situation)

	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_1	U-H_2	CIT
Self						
Very important	23	36	19	36	38	27
Somewhat important	46	43	50	57	50	45
Not important	28	21	28	7	12	25
Others						
Very important	11	7	2	21	25	10
Somewhat important	43	43	47	50	50	46
Not important	35	36	40	14	6	33

%

The rather strong support that faculty respondents gave to the first statement, with its more abstract wording and emphasis on "interdisciplinary contacts," was reduced somewhat in the second instance, where the wording is precise (although the commitment is theoretical). But, regarding themselves, faculty profess to have an interest in cross-disciplinary contacts and teaching. They appear to be responsive to this form of innovation (in a day when specialism and fragmentation are said by critics to characterize the university). But the enthusiasm respondents claim for themselves is not attributed in the same measure to faculty colleagues. On the older campuses, particularly, a sizable proportion of faculty are thought to regard cross-disciplinary teaching as "Not important." U-J, a new and "innovative" campus is, again, much closer to U-G and U-I than to U-H. Faculty respondents at both U-H colleges put themselves and their peers in support of this form of innovation.

Another item dealt with faculty attitudes toward innovation and experimentation by reporting findings on a question where faculty were asked to rank colleagues, as personal observation allowed, on the attitude of colleagues toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of their colleges (two subsections used):

FQ19 Willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures

%

	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_1	U-H_2	CIT
Most	17	36	4	71	50	20
About half	24	21	13	21	19	23
Some	42	36	62	7	19	43
Very few	11	7	14	0	0	9

Not hostile to innovation but unwilling to get involved personally

%

	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_1	U-H_2	CIT
Most	20	14	29	0	0	18
About half	28	21	39	29	6	30
Some	36	43	20	43	50	35
Very few	9	14	5	29	25	11

At U-G and U-I less than 50% of the respondents stated that half or more of their colleagues would be willing to become personally involved in innovation. More than half thought most of their peers would not want to get involved. Both U-J and U-H faculty were judged on the basis of these samples to be more inclined to innovate. Over half of the U-J sample and three-fourths or more of the U-H respondents thought "Almost half" to "Most" of their peers would participate personally in educational changes. U-I appears to be the campus where faculty were most likely to shun personal involvement in innovation and experimentation, whereas U-H_1 faculty showed the highest level of potential involvement. (U-H_2 was in its first academic quarter at the time of the study, and faculty there may, justifiably, have been more cautious about judging colleagues on the basis of such brief experience.)

The indices of innovation used in the faculty and student questionnaires were few compared to the many innovations being tried in institutions of higher education today. Indeed, a number of changes other than those stated in questionnaire items were mentioned in administrative interviews or were listed in various institutional publications, and certain of these have been mentioned at various points in this report (see IX 25-30).

One of the open response sections of the faculty questionnaire called for participants to write out, without multiple-choice items being provided, their answer to this question--"What do you think are the most distinctive features of your college?" At U-G, 20% of the sample gave no reply. Ten percent said that the most distinctive thing about U-G was its image, style, or ethos--probably a reference to the community spirit or attitude of friendliness about which the administrators spoke. Five percent said there was nothing especially distinctive about the campus, but nearly half seemed pressed to offer multiple distinctions covering a wide area, from facilities to personnel.

The U-J faculty sample divided as follows: The largest percentage among the single category responses (20%) went to "new programs," or to specific forms of innovation and experimentation as the most distinctive features of the campus. More than 60% gave answers similar to the U-G group, but with the new developments listed frequently. Only one person in the U-J sample mentioned the strength of the departments and the accomplishments of the faculty as the special distinctions of the campus. Thirteen percent at U-J did not answer.

Responses at U-I were even more widely scattered than at the other campuses of the university. The largest cluster of answers in a single category had to do with the growth rate of the campus, and the impact of that growth (7%). Four percent, the second largest grouping, said there was nothing especially distinctive about U-I. By far the largest proportion of answers (56%) was in the multiple response category. But, as elsewhere, there was no evident unity of opinion. The no response rate on this item for the U-I sample was 20%.

Faculty samples from U-H_1 and U-H_2, especially from the latter college, were clustered largely about "innovation and experimentation" or "new programs" and in the multiple response category--emphasizing the holistic or inclusive nature of the distinctiveness there. Fourteen percent at U-H_1 and 25% at U-H_2 did not answer.

The repeated insistence by administrators interviewed on the several campuses that faculty controlled academic policy formulation at UniWestern to the extent that leadership for change by administrators was nearly impossible, prompts the reporting of such findings which show faculty opinions about the sources of change and the distribution of power on the several campuses. One question read:

FQ8 Where have the initiatives come from for recent changes in your institution?

				%		
	U-G	U-J$_1$	U-I	U-H$_1$	U-H$_2$	CIT
Faculty	25	53	30	14	6	25
Administrators	16	0	6	0	19	15
Students	3	0	7	0	0	2
External influences (state legislature, constiuency, national agencies)	3	0	3	0	0	2
Faculty and Administrators	16	33	16	50	31	25
Other combinations	18	7	24	28	6	20

The above table suggests that while the faculty see themselves as a strong influence in the initiation of change, they know that they are far from alone in providing leadership. Administrators, on the other hand, tend to deprecate their role in institutional leadership--they have been crucial in providing leadership for the changing colleges and universities of this study--while the faculty tend to overstate their own importance, encouraged to do so by administration. Yet reports on questionnaire items, such as the one above, indicate that leadership has been in fact usually shared.

The second question that has relevance for the topic of institutional leadership in the present climate of change read:

FQ18 Who would you say has the most powerful voice in determining the educational policies, i.e., the general objectives rather than the particulars of a given program, in your college? (Most influential only listed below.)

%

	U-G	U-J_1	U-I	U-H_1	U-H_2	CIT
Trustees or regents	4	0	5	14	6	5
Chief administrative officer of your campus (president, chancellor)	12	0	21	21	31	20
Chief administrative officer of your program (dean, provost)	15	7	6	14	19	18
Division head	0	0	2	0	6	1
An executive committee	6	21	1	0	0	6
The general faculty	46	57	42	36	0	33
Students	0	0	1	0	0	0
Constituency	1	7	0	0	0	1
Statewide coordinating agency	2	0	3	0	0	1
Others	3	0	1	7	6	2
No response	11	7	17	7	31	12

The centrality of faculty leadership in general educational policy formulation is asserted by the faculty samples, although on the two older campuses, where there has been a tradition of strong administrative participation, that fact is acknowledged. At U-G, where the administration has seen itself as existing to implement faculty decisions, the faculty responded by making the strongest comparative claim for faculty leadership. The report of U-H is confused by the fact that U-H_2 faculty were just getting established and could only respond to the question by acknowledging the leadership of administrators in planning the college, whereas U-H_1

faculty reported shared leadership during the one year they had been working together. The spirit of collegiality seemed stronger there than in the other samples.

Students are clearly disenfranchised everywhere.

In conclusion, it is the dominance of the ideal of professionalism on these campuses that must be emphasized. It provides the norms by which institutional character at UniWestern is defined, achieved, and changed. Decentralization of the university's central administration, then, can be expected to produce only diversity in external structure and functions, not value diversity.

Value convergence to the point of conformity is resulting in isomorphism--the condition of being, or wanting to be, identical in form or substance despite a different ancestry. So U-I has come from a teachers college and liberal arts tradition but is bent now on becoming a general university campus, featuring standards set by graduate and professional specializations. U-G, from farm status and agricultural center, is now becoming a general university campus. U-J, starting at the graduate level, is extending the values of its professionally oriented faculty into new undergraduate programs originally intended to avoid the very problems the graduate professional mentality helps to create. U-H, still the most innovative, created to be different, but apparently unable to innovate in its relations to statewide planning and unwilling to innovate in its relationship with the university's conservative academic senate, will eventually embrace 27,000 students and become another general university campus complete with graduate and professional programs.

One consequence of isomorphism is that discrimination is rampant in the university, not toward those of a different color or socio-economic status but toward those whose qualities are not defined or validated by the conventional criteria of academic excellence.

If that consequence closes some good people out, a second one ties good people down. Isomorphism, in the professional ghetto which is the university, threatens substantive diversity. UniWestern's structures and functions encourage variations on a common theme in a day which calls for the harmonization of seemingly dissonant voices and the effective expression of multiple themes.

CHAPTER X

COMPARATIVE FACULTY DATA: THE DIFFERENT AND THE LIKE

In the preceding chapters, colleges and universities of the Institutional Character study were described and evaluated according to their regard for educational philosophy and institutional goals, the conventional standard of excellence, and change, innovation and experimentation. In this chapter, faculty data is sorted to determine how variables other than affiliation with a particular institution figure in the determination of professional values and the emergence of institutional distinctiveness.

The total sample (N = 577) was divided, first, into two groups called "Junior" and "Senior" faculty as determined by the critical seven years or tenure hurdle. Junior faculty, one to six years of service, numbered 234, while Senior faculty, seven or more years, totaled 332. Respondents were also sorted by academic rank across all schools, by undergraduate teaching load, and by record of publications (articles). Additionally, the sample was "cut" according to the established divisions of the liberal arts: the humanities (including fine arts), the social or behavioral sciences, and the physical and natural sciences. Representative academic disciplines in the humanities (N = 200) were English, philosophy, religion, art, music, languages, history, journalism; in the social or behavioral sciences (N = 116), psychology, sociology, economics, political science, geography, anthropology; and the natural and physical sciences (N = 167) included biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, medicine.

Comparative data were also compiled on faculty in various types of institutions. By use of these tables researchers extended evaluations beyond those available from the composite institutional total--the CIT--and pursued various sub-groupings of faculty by type of schools. Two classifications were decided upon. The first was a comparison of those institutions which could be said to be characterized by inclusive innovation--"Radicals"--and those which featured the conventional criteria of excellence--"Standard Bearers." Grouped as Radicals (faculty N = 75) were South College, the university colleges coded as East-D and West-F, and UniWestern H_1 and H_2. Standard Bearers (faculty N = 436) were North College; the two colleges of UniEastern, U-A and U-B; the core college of East University, East-C; the same at West, West-E; and two campuses of UniWestern, U-G and U-I. Since neither of these categories was appropriate for a few of the institutions in the study, certain colleges were not included in the Radicals vs. Standard Bearers analysis.

The second classification compared the new colleges--"Newcomers"--with colleges that had been in existence prior to the organization of the newcomers as a part of the sponsoring university. These were called "Elder Siblings." Both of these groups were then compared to the small liberal arts colleges--"Libarts." Included as Newcomers (faculty N = 73) were the new private cluster colleges in actual operation at the time of the project, East-D and West-F, and the new colleges of UniWestern, four in number but located on two campuses--code names U-J_1 and U-J_2, U-H_1 and U-H_2. Colleges A and B of UniEastern, East-C and West-E comprised the group of Elder Siblings (faculty N = 158). The four independent

Libarts colleges (faculty N = 104) were South, Southeast, Midwest and North.

In the Newcomers vs. Elder Siblings vs. Libarts comparison, as with Radicals vs. Standard Bearers, not all of the institutions in the study were included. The group called Newcomers overlaps with the group of Radicals. Similarly, the Elder Siblings overlap but do not include all the Standard Bearers. Libarts are either Radicals, or Standard Bearers, or neither. Every institution in the study is included in at least one of the two major classifications.

The following table shows the correspondence of college or university code names to institutional categories.

FACULTY SAMPLES BY TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

Standard Bearers	North UniEastern U-A,U-B East-C West-E UniWestern U-G,U-I
Radicals	South East-D West-F UniWestern U-H_1,U-H_2,
Libarts	North Midwest Southeast South
Elder Siblings	UniEastern U-A,U-B East-C West-E
Newcomers	East-D West-F UniWestern U-H_1,U-H_2,U-J_1,U-J_2

Research staff concentrated attention when working with these comparative faculty data, whether in institutional or professional groupings, on the areas of concern emphasized throughout the case studies. Following is a list of those concerns and the items in the faculty questionnaire that were regarded as most relevant:

I Educational philosophy and general institutional purposes: items 1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 18.

II Conventional criteria of excellence--the Standard: items 2 (11-12), 12 (50-51), 12 (56-57), 12 (58-59), 12 (60-61).

III Change, innovation and experimentation: general attitudes--items 2 (9-10), 10, 15 (8), 15 (12), 19. Attitudes toward specific innovations--items 2 (17-18), 4, 12 (52-53), 12 (62-63), 12 (64-65), 14 (3).

IV Various professional activities of faculty: items 2 (7-8), 2 (15-16), 2 (19-20), 2 (21-22), 12 (54-55), 12 (56-57), 12 (58-59).

V Faculty ideas of the university in the societal context: items 15 (7), 15 (9), 15 (11).

VI Miscellaneous assumptions and values--personal, social, intellectual: items 13, 14 (2), 14 (6), 15 (10), 16.

The chi square test was used on the data for these various cuts. In sorting questionnaire item data, responses were eliminated which involved comments placed in the margin qualifying the answer to such an extent that it was unclear whether the faculty member wanted his response coded one way or another. For the most part, this elimination of data did not affect the chi square sufficiently to change the interpretation. Also, when a faculty member did not respond to the question, or gave a variant reply, he was not included in the analysis. This made the interpretation of the significant difference easier as the responses were on the same scale (e.g., Very important, Somewhat important, Not important). Certain items were not tested because the response options were not on such a continuum. With data modified in these ways, those differences which appear are differences between all those faculty members responding to the question by using the response categories available in the questionnaire.

The item analysis to follow will, unless otherwise specified, report only those differences significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Comparative institutional faculty data analyses to be reported here are (1) Radicals versus Standard Bearers and (2) Libarts, Elder Siblings, and Newcomers.

Faculty comparisons to be reported are: (1) between Senior and Junior members, and by academic rank with Instructors grouped with Assistant Professors and Associate Professors grouped with full Professors, (2) according to the divisions of the liberal arts--humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences, (3) according to professional articles published: zero to three, four to ten, eleven and more, and (4) by teaching load, zero to eight and nine to sixteen hours. Since these comparisons are concerned with the individual faculty member rather than the institution of which he is a part, the self ratings only are used in the analysis of question 2 and 12.

Newcomers, Libarts, Elder Siblings. Radicals, Standard Bearers

I. Educational Philosophy and Institutional Purposes

Q-1 When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the particular task for which you were being considered? (Please check one)

____Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed at greater length than the particulars of the job.
____About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job description.
____The institutional philosophy and educational purposes were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.
____The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would relate thereto.

Newcomers generally said that institutional objectives were treated at greater length than the particulars of the job. Libarts said about equal attention was given to each. Elder Siblings said that emphasis was clearly on the work of the department.

Seventy-three percent of the Radicals compared to only 6% of the Standard Bearers reported that in job negotiations institutional objectives were treated at greater length than the particulars of the job. Fifty-four percent of the Standard Bearers and just 1% of the Radicals reported that the emphasis of the interviews was on the work of the department.

Q-5 What proportion of the present faculty do you consider to be seriously concerned, pro or con, with the formal institutional purposes that are intended to give direction and character to your college?

____Almost all
____Well over half
____About half
____One-fourth or so
____Very few
____Such things are not the concern of the faculty

(Note: Only the first five response options were used in the analysis.)

Newcomers judged that "Almost all" of their colleagues were seriously concerned with institutional objectives; Libarts felt that "Well over half" were so concerned; Elder Siblings said that "About half" of their colleagues were of this mind.

Q-9 Do your colleagues express much loyalty for the history and traditions of this institution?
(If you are a faculty member at a new college established within the general framework of a university, apply this question to that university.)

____About as much as faculties in similar institutions elsewhere
____More than in similar institutions elsewhere
____Less than in similar institutions elsewhere

Newcomers and Libarts tended to report that their colleagues expressed more loyalty for the history and traditions of their institution than was the case with the Elder Siblings. Newcomers saw their colleagues as generally expressing more loyalty than faculties in similar institutions elsewhere (Libarts wavered between "about as much" and "more than" but were different from Newcomers only at the .05 level). Elder Siblings felt that the situation at their institution regarding loyalty was about the same as elsewhere.

Radicals said that their colleagues expressed more loyalty for the history and traditions of the institution than faculties in similar institutions elsewhere, but Standard Bearers thought that their colleagues expressed about as much loyalty as faculties elsewhere.

II. Conventional Standard of Excellence

Q-12 Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.*

(58-59) Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities

Personal View	View of Others
____Very important	____Very important
____Somewhat important	____Somewhat important
____Not important	____Not important

All three groups--Newcomers, Libarts and Elder Siblings--saw professional meetings and attendant responsibilities as Somewhat important. The only difference was in the self ratings between Libarts and Newcomers where the Libarts rated the item higher.

This item was again given a rating of Somewhat important by the Radicals and the Standard Bearers. But the Standard Bearers put more emphasis on it than did the Radicals in the Personal View section. The responses of the two groups were nearly identical in the View of Others section.

Q-12 (60-61) The theoretical importance of...Research and writing

In the self ratings of this question, all three groups said that research and writing were Very important. Newcomers gave this item more importance than Libarts did, however. Newcomers maintained their lead in the Others section by saying that this responsibility was Very important for colleagues while the Libarts and Elder Siblings lowered their ratings to Somewhat important. Again, the only difference significant at the .01 level was between Newcomers and Libarts, but the Newcomers did differ from the Elder Siblings at the .05 level.

Standard Bearers regarded research and writing as Very important for their colleagues and themselves. Radicals agreed that these opportunities were Very important for themselves, but they rated them as only Somewhat important for colleagues.

---

*The body of Question 12 will hereafter be abbreviated as "The theoretical importance of..."

III. Change, Innovation, and Experimentation

A. General attitude

Q-2 The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check.)*

(9-10) an opportunity for experimentation and innovation.

Personal View	View of Others
____Very important	____Very important
____Somewhat important	____Somewhat important
____Not important	____Not important

An opportunity for experimentation and innovation was regarded by all three groups as Very important for themselves, yet Newcomers said Very important significantly more often than Elder Siblings. When speaking for Others, only Newcomers said Very important--both Elder Siblings and Libarts said Somewhat important. But Newcomers and Libarts were both significantly higher than Elder Siblings on this section of the question.

Faculty respondents in colleges designated as Radicals placed more importance for themselves and for colleagues on an opportunity for experimentation and innovation than did Standard Bearers. The Radicals called it Very important throughout while the Standard Bearers called it Very important in the self ratings but only Somewhat important in the View of Others.

Q-15 Here are some ideas about higher education in the context of change. Check the category that best indicates your personal view on each of these matters*

---

*The body of Question 2 will hereafter be abbreviated as "The importance of...," thereby differing from Question 12 which has been abbreviated as "The theoretical importance of...".

(8) Too much emphasis is presently being placed on innovation and experimentation in higher education. Existing standards and arrangements are sound, and these should be achieved and utilized--not replaced.

____Strongly agree
____Agree
____Can't say
____Disagree
____Strongly disagree

(Note: For the purposes of the test, Strongly agree was grouped with Agree and Strongly disagree with Disagree. Can't say was omitted.)

Newcomers, Libarts and Elder Siblings all disagreed that too much emphasis was being placed on innovation and experimentation. The Elder Siblings' disagreement was not as strong as that of the Newcomers or the Libarts, however.

Similarly, while the Radicals and the Standard Bearers both tended to disagree that innovation and experimentation were overemphasized in higher education, the disagreement was not so strong among Standard Bearers as among Radicals.

Q-19 Please scale your faculty colleagues, as personal observation allows, on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of your college by checking one response for each item:*

(31) Seem to favor "change for change's sake"

____Most
____About half
____Some
____Very few

---

*The body of Question 15 will hereafter be abbreviated as "Personal view of the idea that...".

*Question 19 will be abbreviated as "Proportion of colleagues...".

Fifty-nine percent of the Standard Bearers and 46% of the Radicals reported that Very few of their colleagues seemed to favor change for change's sake, but the Standard Bearers were more confident that this was not the case at their institutions.

(32) Proportion of colleagues...Willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures (Most to Very few)

Newcomers felt that Most of their colleagues were willing to participate in experimental educational ventures; Libarts estimated that About half of their colleagues were so inclined; Elder Siblings said that Some of their colleagues would do this. These differences were significant at the .01 level.

The majority of respondents from Radical institutions felt that most of their colleagues would be willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures, while the majority of those from Standard Bearer institutions felt that only Some of their colleagues would do this.

Q-19 (33) Proportion of colleagues...Not hostile to innovation, but unwilling to get involved personally (Most to Very few)

Elder Siblings reported more often than Libarts or Newcomers that this was true of their colleagues. About half, they said, were not hostile to innovation, but would likely be unwilling to get involved personally. The Libarts said that this was true for Some of their colleagues. Newcomers differed from Libarts at the .05 level of confidence when they said that either Some or Very few of their peers were so disposed.

Standard Bearers felt that About half to Some of their colleagues could be described as being not hostile to innovation, but unwilling to get involved personally. The majority of the Radicals felt that only a

Very few or Some of their colleagues held such an attitude.

Q-19 (34) Proportion of colleagues who...Hold to the principle that "nothing new must be tried for the first time" (Most to Very few)

All three groups said that Very few of their colleagues held to this notion. Elder Siblings reported that this was the case with more of their colleagues than was true for Newcomers.

Eighty-seven percent of the Radicals, compared to 66% of the Standard Bearers, felt that Very few of their colleagues believed that "nothing new must be tried for the first time."

Q-19 (35) Proportion of colleagues who...Believe that "if it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change" (Most to Very few)

As with the preceding item, all three groups felt that this was true of only a Very few of their colleagues. The estimate of the Newcomers was significantly smaller than that of the Elders or the Libarts, however.

Seventy-five percent of the Radicals felt that only a Very few of their colleagues believed that "if it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change." Forty-eight percent of the Standard Bearers said the same, but the two groups were found to differ statistically.

B. Attitude toward specific innovations

Q-2 (17-18) The importance of...Inter-disciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities.

Libarts and Newcomers saw interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities as Very important for themselves. They were significantly different in this regard from Elder Siblings who rated the item as Somewhat important. When speaking for their colleagues, Elder Siblings again rated the item less favorably than Libarts or Newcomers, but all groups saw it as Somewhat important.

Radicals considered interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities to be Very important for themselves but Somewhat important for colleagues. They placed more emphasis on this item than did Standard Bearers, who rated it as Somewhat important for themselves as well as others.

Q-12 (52-53) The theoretical importance of...Cross-disciplinary teaching.

The Elder Siblings did not consider cross-disciplinary teaching to be as important as did Newcomers and Libarts. The Elders rated it as only Somewhat important for themselves while Libarts wavered between Somewhat important and Very important and Newcomers said Very important. The relationship between the three groups was the same when they spoke of their colleagues, but the ratings were lower--Newcomers and Libarts saying Somewhat important and Elder Siblings saying Not important.

Radicals placed more emphasis on cross-disciplinary teaching than did Standard Bearers. The self rating of the Radicals was Very important while that of the Standard Bearers was Somewhat important. When rating colleagues, both groups said Somewhat important, but the Radicals were still more favorably disposed toward this innovation.

Q-12 (64-65) The theoretical importance of...Tutorials and other one-to-one student-faculty learning arrangements.

There were no significant differences between Newcomers, Libarts and Elder Siblings in the Personal View section although the majority of Newcomers called it Very important while the other groups said Somewhat important. In the View of Others section, all three groups generally called tutorials Somewhat important, but Newcomers gave the item a more favorable rating than was the case with Elder Siblings.

Radicals rated tutorials and other one-to-one student-faculty learning arrangements as Very important for themselves but Somewhat important for colleagues. They nevertheless placed more importance on this item than did the Standard Bearers who rated it Somewhat important consistently.

IV. Professional Activities

Q-12 (7-8) The importance of...Opportunity for professional advancement

When speaking of themselves, the majority of the Standard Bearers felt that opportunities for professional advancement were Very important, while the Radicals split their sentiments between Very important and Somewhat important. But the difference in emphasis between these groups was not significant except in the View of Others section. Here, the Standard Bearers placed more emphasis on the feature than the Radicals did, though both groups said it was Very important.

Q-12 (15-16) The importance of...An emphasis on teaching

There was no difference between the three groups in the Personal View section of the question, all tending to call it Very important. But when speaking for their colleagues, the Libarts group put more importance on this than the other two groups. Libarts maintained that it was Very important for colleagues while Newcomers and Elder Siblings wavered between Very important and Somewhat important in this section.

Radicals placed more importance than Standard Bearers on an emphasis on teaching in the self ratings, where they both called it Very important, and in the Others ratings, where the Radicals maintained that it was Very important and the Standard Bearers said that it was just Somewhat important.

Q-12 (54-55) The theoretical importance of...Student advising and counselling.

Libarts put more emphasis on student advising and counselling than either the Elder Siblings or the Newcomers. They judged this as Very important for themselves, while the Elder Siblings and Newcomers wavered between Very important and Somewhat important. In the View of Others section the difference between the Newcomers and the Libarts disappeared, but the difference between the Libarts and the Elder Siblings remained. All three groups generally judged it as Somewhat important for colleagues.

Both Radicals and Standard Bearers split their ratings between Very important and Somewhat important in the Personal View section of this item. When they rated their colleagues, Radicals put more emphasis on student advising and counselling than did Standard Bearers, but both groups called this Somewhat important.

V. The university in the societal context

Q-15 (9) Personal view of the idea that...The concept of _in loco parentis_ is unnecessary and undesirable because students should have the freedoms and responsibilities of adults. (Agree or disagree)

The Newcomers showed stronger agreement than the other two groups with the idea that _in loco parentis_ is unnecessary, but all three groups generally agreed with the statement.

Both Radicals and Standard Bearers agreed with this idea, but among the Standard Bearers there were more respondents who disagreed than there were among Radicals.

Q-15 (11) Personal view of the idea that...Course work should be more relevant to the social and political realities in the world outside the campus. (Agree or disagree)

The only statistically significant difference on this question was between Radicals and Standard Bearers. Both groups agreed, but the Standard Bearers' agreement was not so strong as that of the Radicals.

VI. Miscellaneous subjects (personal, social, intellectual)

Q-14 (2) Applicability to your institution of the opinion that: Not enough emphasis is placed on shaping the student's moral and ethical values. (Agree or disagree)

Newcomers, Elder Siblings and Standard Bearers all denied that it was the case in their institution that not enough emphasis was placed on shaping the student's moral and ethical values. Elder Siblings showed less disagreement than the other two groups, however.

The difference between Radicals and Standard Bearers on this question was sharp. Again, both groups disagreed, but among the Radicals only 17% agreed, while the corresponding figure among Standard Bearers was 42%.

Q-16 Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how would you describe yourself in the area of religion?

____Deeply religious
____Moderately religious
____Largely indifferent to religion
____Basically opposed to religion
____Prefer not to answer

(Note: Only the first four response options were used in the analysis.)

The Libarts declared themselves to be religious more often than the Newcomers or the Elder Siblings. They most frequently said they were Moderately religious but several said they were Deeply religious. Elders wavered between rating themselves as Moderately religious and Largely indifferent to religion. Newcomers most frequently said they were Basically opposed to religion, but they did not differ significantly from the Elder Siblings.

"Juniors" vs. "Seniors," Ladder rank faculty

When "Junior" (one to six years) faculty were compared to "Senior" (seven or more years) faculty, significant differences were found on only two items. The first was question 15 (8): "Too much emphasis is presently being placed on innovation and experimentation in higher education. Existing standards and arrangements are sound, and these should be achieved and utilized--not replaced." Both groups generally disagreed, but Juniors showed stronger disagreement than Seniors.

The second area of differentiation was in question 15 (9): "The concept of in loco parentis is unnecessary and undesirable because students should have the freedoms and responsibilities of adults." Juniors showed stronger support for this idea than Seniors, but both groups generally agreed.

When instructors were grouped because of their small number (N = 16) with assistant professors, and associate professors were combined with full professors, the results were the same as when grouping faculty by the number of years of full-time teaching, except at one point. Question 2 (21) asked faculty about the importance to them of an "Opportunity to influence departmental policies." The higher ranking faculty placed more importance on such opportunities than the instructors and assistant professors.

On all other items in the areas mentioned and in the areas of educational philosophy and general institutional purposes, the Standard, and miscellaneous personal, social, and intellectual values, there were no statistically significant differences between Junior and Senior or between the academic rank divisions of faculty.

Academic Disciplines

When the faculty sample was sorted by the classical divisions of the liberal arts--humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences--differences were significant on only three items.

All three groups agreed to the statement in question 15 (12) which read: "Radical technological changes in our society necessitate radical changes in the educational experiences offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different." Yet the social scientists and the natural scientists showed more agreement with this than did faculty in the humanities.

The groups also differed in the extent of their agreement with question 15 (11): "Course work should be more relevant to the social and political realities in the world outside the campus." Social science faculty members showed more agreement with this than humanities faculty or natural scientists. The natural scientists, in fact, showed only a tenuous agreement.

A difference at the level of personal, social, and intellectual values was found in faculty responses to the quotation on relativism which appeared in question 13 (See Appendix). Humanities faculty and natural scientists generally felt that this statement was correct, but social scientists did not.

Data stratification did not reveal any other differences in the themes mentioned above or in the realms of educational philosophy and general institutional purposes, the Standard, specific innovations, or professional activities.

Number of Publications

Faculty were separated into three categories according to the number of articles reported published: those who had published between zero and three articles, those who had published from four to ten, and those who had published eleven or more. For the most part, differences that were found concerned the relative importance of teaching and research, the importance placed on research increasing with the number of articles published.

Three items exemplary of this trend follow: Question 2 (11) concerned the importance of the "availability of research money and facilities." Faculty members who had published three or fewer articles called this feature Somewhat important --a significantly lower rating than that given by those who had published either four to ten or eleven or more articles. Both of these latter groups called the availability of research money and facilities Very important.

A similar item, question 12 (60), asked faculty to judge the importance of "research and writing." Those faculty members who had published eleven or more articles placed more importance on these matters than did faculty who had published either from four to ten or from zero to three articles. (Likewise, those who had published from four to ten articles were more concerned for research and writing than those who had published three or less, but this difference was significant only at the .05 level.)

A third item concerned the relative importance of "an emphasis on teaching." All three groups rated this as Very important, but the group publishing the least found it to be more important than did the other two groups.

The remaining differences between these groups were in the area of "change, innovation, and experimentation." Their general attitudes toward change were shown to be somewhat different in question 2 (9) which concerned the importance of "An opportunity for experimentation and innovation." Such an opportunity was more important to those who had published eleven or more articles than to either of the other two groups. The difference between those who had published eleven or more articles and those who had published three or fewer was significant only at the .05 level, however. And all three groups declared this to be Very important.

The specific innovation of student participation in academic governance was received differently by those who had published fewer than four articles than by those who had published eleven or more. All three groups answered "No" to question 4 (32), "Should students at your college participate more significantly than they do at present in the formulation and implementation of academic policies, i.e., in establishing the content and organization of courses, on academic policy committees, by student-formed and student-led seminars?" But those faculty who had published least were not so negative as those who had published most.

Faculty stratified by the number of articles published showed no differences on the other sections in the above questionnaire items or on other items dealing with such themes as educational philosophy and general institutional purposes, the university in the societal context, or personal, social, and intellectual values.

Teaching Load

Faculty respondents were divided in another section of the cross-cuts into two groups determined by undergraduate teaching load. The first group consisted of faculty members who reported that they taught from zero to eight hours of undergraduate classes; the second group consisted of those who reported teaching from nine to sixteen hours.

Analysis of the questionnaire item dealing with attention given to institutional purposes at the time faculty respondents were hired, question 1, revealed that persons carrying less than nine hours of classes remembered that the emphasis when they were employed was primarily on specific duties, while faculty carrying nine hours or more were more likely to have discussed the philosophy of the institution as well as their specific duties.

With regard to the Standard, the group teaching fewer classes differed from the group teaching more on two predictable items. Both of these related to research and teaching. The group spending fewer hours in the classroom concerned themselves more with research and the group spending more hours teaching concerned themselves with teaching rather than research issues.

In question 2 (11) those faculty members teaching less than nine hours of classes placed more importance on research money and facilities than those who taught more. The first group declared that this was Very important while the second group found it Somewhat important. The results were very similar in question 12 (60) which concerned the importance of research and writing. The first group again put more emphasis on these features than did the second. Both groups agreed that research and writing was Very important, but nearly half of the group teaching nine or more hours of classes said that it was just Somewhat important.

In the area of change, innovation and experimentation, the two faculty groups were at odds over only one specific innovation. Those who taught fewer than nine hours of classes placed less importance on "interdisciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities"--question 2 (17)--than faculty in the other group. Those with fewer classes called this item Somewhat important while faculty with nine or more hours of classes called it Very important.

With respect to certain sections of question 2, (7)...the importance of professional advancement and (15)...the importance of an emphasis on teaching, "An opportunity for professional advancement" was Very important for faculty teaching fewer than nine hours but only Somewhat important for those teaching more. "An emphasis on teaching" was more important for faculty who taught more often than for those who taught less often. Both groups, however, declared this to be Very important.

When stratified by undergraduate teaching load, faculty differed not at all with respect to general attitudes toward change, innovation and experimentation; the means for implementing innovations; their ideas of the university in the societal context; and on various personal, social and intellectual values.

The Different and the Like

These cross-cuts on faculty data, whether by age categories, publications, academic specializations, teaching load--whether old or new schools, conventional or innovative, show that faculty are more alike than dissimilar in their attitudes toward educational assumptions, values, and goals, the criteria for institutional excellence, and the prospects for professional or institutional change.

There are, to be sure, important gradations of difference when the professional groups are compared on certain items, e.g., younger faculty are less inclined than older to support the concept of *in loco parentis*, with its corollary of parietal rules, and social scientists are more likely than people in the humanities or natural sciences to favor the notion that the institution of higher education should be more responsive to social change. However, over against these gradations, on item after item there were no statistically significant differences among faculty while comparative data analyses made clear their overwhelming degree of likemindedness. When differences did appear, they were often a matter of degree: A small majority in one group and a large majority in the other had chosen the same response, the conditions of statistical significance were satisfied--the two or three groups declared to be different. But was the difference sufficient to claim that an alternative set of values had been presented?

On the other hand, it should not be concluded that the differences that do exist on campus, or that appear to be emerging there, are unimportant. They may prove to be the first fruits of a bumper crop of changes leading to substantive differentiation in American higher education. But it can be said that most colleges and universities, administrators and faculty alike, have become the victims of their own rhetoric, suffering the consequences of their own careless use of language, because they have claimed the presence of diversity that was not there and, worse, they have professed loyalty to diversity they did not practice. It may be a matter of error compounded by hypocrisy.

When faculty were invited to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the Robert Hutchins assertion--"The duty of the faculty is to formulate the purposes and programs of the university. The duty of the regents [trustees] is to interpret and defend them."--respondents from Newcomers, Libarts and Elder Siblings institutions all agreed with the quotation. However faculty in the Elder Sibling group said elsewhere that only about half of their colleagues were seriously concerned, pro or con, with the institutional purposes that were supposed to give direction and character to their colleges or universities. At yet another point, they said that when they were employed negotiations had been focused on the work of the department, not on general institutional objectives. Clearly, for one reason or another, large numbers of faculty and administrators have not been giving themselves very seriously to those areas of concern which faculty have claimed to be their proper domain. They may not have done so because of technical or legal barriers, frustration, negligence, or the press of competing loyalties, but, whatever, the result has been a takeover by a suprainstitutional value orientation--professionalism, with a loss of value diversity.

However, if attention is given more to those cross-cuts of faculty by types of institutions--Newcomers, Libarts, Elder Siblings, or Radicals and Standard Bearers--than to data from the various professional groupings --years of experience, teaching loads, specializations, publications-- there is reason to speak of improving prospects for change. There was, for example, marked differentiation between faculty at the new cluster colleges as compared to faculty at the older colleges of the same universities in such areas of concern as awareness of institutional purposes and loyalty to those purposes. This may be evidence of an available mechanism, the cluster college concept, that encourages correctives to the aforementioned problems of ignorance and evasion.

The Newcomers as well as the Radicals showed tendencies to break away from the dominance of the conventional criteria of excellence and to become institutional probes for alternative futures. They were, the preceding data show, more interested than the Standard Bearers in change, innovation, and experimentation.

The Libarts group also emerged with points of distinction as in their commitment to student advising and counselling. Usually, however, this group stood between Newcomers and Radicals on the one hand and Elder Siblings and Standard Bearers on the other. On our scale of values, they are not trailing behind, as those who position institutions by the conventional marks of excellence would have us believe, but they are somewhere in between, behind the leaders of change but in front of those former pace setters who have allowed the burden of their "honors" to make them fall behind.

Those persons who favor the standardization of higher education in this country, believing that there are certain assumptions about the role of educational institutions to which all schools should aspire if not adhere, and believing that there is or can be agreement on what constitutes liberal education, the sociology of learning or how teaching and learning should be structured, may take comfort from the data of this study which seem to show that the overwhelming majority of faculty are so much alike. The standard of conventional excellence continues to be well represented.

Those persons who favor diversification in structures and functions, yet also of values and styles, to the point of creating viable alternative tracks to the achievement of conventional standards of excellence, or, who favor change to the point of transforming established thinking about education, certification, and socialization, may take comfort from the emergence of colleges in established universities, here called Newcomers and often Radicals, where evidence seems to be accumulating that structural and organizational provisions for change do help to effect it, that faculty can be found whose values on important issues are different, or, if not that, who are at least open to change because they are in an atmosphere where they are constantly reminded that their institution has a will to be different.

CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSIONS

Every college or university has "character" in the sense that it has characteristic programs or activities by which the institution can be identified. Indeed, these administrative and organizational differences, plus their quantitative and qualitative effects, have been the basis for the claims that America has the world's most diversified system of education.

But does diversity in structures and functions mean diversity at the level of basic values? Given the range in types of institutions and the variety of roles for individuals within them, it would seem likely that value differentiation as a consequence of role differentiation would be a conspicuous feature of college and university life and an integral part of the diversity claimed for the system. However, it is precisely this "obvious" outcome that was not supported by the findings of the Institutional Character research project. Beneath diverse structures and functions we found uniformity in educational assumptions and socio-political values across major interest groups and in various types of institutions.

This general conclusion will be emphasized throughout this chapter because of its far-reaching significance: American higher education has been characterized by conformity where diversity is needed, that is, at the level of values. External variety and surface change have concealed the conformity and rigidity in fundamental values even as false confidence that differences in external forms and appearances must result in varied internal assumptions, or, from another theoretical perspective, that differences in structure and function are always manifestations of differences in values, has diverted attention from that prerequisite to significant change--examination of the deep values.

Values have been present and operating, though poorly understood and seldom examined, at a time when major changes in the institution of higher education were needed but could not be affected without conscious attention to values. As Sir Walter Moberly stated over twenty years ago, the question is not whether educational institutions will have assumptions or basic values, but whether those things which motivate and direct practices will remain as unexamined presuppositions and unacknowledged commitments or will be consciously and persistently reviewed, then reaffirmed, or, when necessary, changed (Moberly, 1949, p. 62).

Certain developments in contemporary society have made essential a deliberate evaluation of the philosophy and basic value orientation of American colleges and universities. One is the rapid rate of societal change. Because the institution of higher education is a service institution, a conception of its nature to which nearly everyone assents (even educators who opt for it to be a center for independent thinking do so in order that it may "serve" society by criticism and creativity), attitudes and functions that characterize the institution must be reviewed for their relevance. Only so can the educational services offered to society be kept congruent with society's needs.

The second feature of contemporary life that has necessitated institutional self-analysis is the emergence of the new youth movement.

These young people have forced colleges and universities to examine their structures and functions--governance configurations, service roles, teaching and learning theories, political relationships. The new youth have been challenging not only the utility of institutional arrangements but the adequacy of the institution's basic ideology. No longer can professors or administrators assume support in the student body for what academics have traditionally proposed to do, any more than for what they have actually done or the way they have done it. There is now no consensus and there is greatly reduced confidence. The institution of higher education is required as never before to prove the viability for the future of its structures and functions and, even more, its assumptions, values and goals.

If the institution is to be validated, it seems essential to ask: Are there functions that set the institution of higher education off from others? If not, why not? If so, what are they? How does the structure of a college or university support or inhibit, form or deform its functions? What are the ends on behalf of which the means operate? Out of the amalgam of purposes, organizations, and activities does anything really distinctive emerge? Can it be said that there is something that gives direction, vitality, or moral excellence to what goes on in the institution?

Getting answers to these questions requires examination of general institutional purposes and, we feel, the emphasis today must be put on that task. But it is important to examine means as well as ends. Christian Bay has written:

> ...every college, ideal in design or not, soon becomes an institutionalized social system in which a fairly stable system of compromises is established. This latter system,

> with varying degrees of success, reconciles educational ideals with the variety of incentives and motives of the persons who occupy the significant roles inside and outside the college (Bay, 1962, p. 987).

Nevitt Sanford accepts the necessity for the study of goals as well as social processes but also warns of what may result:

> The study of objectives must be continued. We do not know enough about the relationship of means to ends; it may be that means that now appear to be necessary to the attainment of one goal actually tend to prevent the others that we deem no less essential (Sanford, 1962, p. 1031).

Because present institutional arrangements may be self-contradictory and in conflict with institutional purposes, and because institutional purposes, assumptions and goals seem to have escaped critical analysis and may not be clear or vital, this and similar studies have focused on the interface between ideology and action. If traditional norms are to survive in colleges and universities, program anomalies must be removed and distortions reduced. If suspected contradictions are found in organization or performance, with assumptions weak or irrelevant, new goals and arrangements for the future must be devised. In all of this both form and content are crucial factors, as is the interaction between them.

Studies of institutional change have tended to concentrate on inducements--contributions, showing the importance of rewards and sanctions for achieving innovations and urging that change leadership be skilled in incentive management--or researchers have emphasized the organizational monolith and have advocated breaking it into more manageable subunite where "goal factoring" and "means-ends chains" can be established, with leadership concentrating on proximate objectives and operational criteria.

Thus a complex organization may be changed by bits and pieces, by tending to the parts that make up the whole (Schiff, 1966, pp. 1-2). Successful innovation, from either theoretical approach, is dependent on the innovator's ability to manipulate an otherwise dominant environment.

But as Schiff and others have noted, not enough emphasis in research or in the literature of organizational theory has been given to the role of fundamental administrative outlooks or basic professional ideologies. For this lack there has seemed to be good reason. General statements of direction involve value assumptions that seldom yield manageable hypotheses and never pan out clean empirical data. "Their almost metaphysical character," says Schiff, in an illustration of academic understatement, "is perhaps disconcernting to students seeking more manageable analytical categories (p. 2)."

Because the Institutional Character study centered on fundamental outlooks and basic ideologies, emphasizing the what and why of institutional life more than the how, when, and where, the methodology for the study included provisions for what Erik Erikson called "disciplined subjectivism." The project's research was not empirical throughout, unless the term is allowed to include observation and experience as much as experimental or quantitative data (and of course the word can quite properly be used that way). What was emphasized was research defined as "disciplined inquiry": research carried out with an awareness of its historical context and methodological limitations; with norms, values or biases clearly stated; language and concepts purposefully employed; and results open and available for analysis by other scholars.

Too much research these days, in our opinion, errs on the side of "data fixation" (Kenneth Boulding) within discrete projects that are manageable in terms of research methodology but meaningless for institutional policy making. While the following statement from Will Durant is extreme and divisive, it conveys the reason researchers in this project sought to maintain an open stance toward relevant, albeit complex, issues. Durant warned forty years ago that "...inductive data fall upon us from all sides like the lava of Vesuvius; we suffocate with uncoordinated facts; our minds are overwhelmed with sciences breeding and multiplying into specialistic chaos for want of synthetic thought and a unifying philosophy (Durant, 1926, p. 102)."

The crucial variables for this project in determining an institution's integrative value system have included educational philosophy--those traditions, myths, assumptions, articulated goals and inarticulate desires that go into an ideology; the structural or organizational norms by which the educational environment today is organized--the main feature of which is the conventional standard of excellence; and finally, various forms of innovation or experimentation as expressions of change. They have been studied in relation to each other and with special attention to the effect of any perceived form of institutional distinctiveness on the person, whatever his role or place in the school.

Researchers hoped by interviews, observation, and the use of questionnaires to determine how institutional character was perceived and what it meant for the lives of people associated with the academic community. Would institutional character be "defined" in essentially quantitative terms and by structural and organizational forms or in more qualitative terms and by axiological categories that might not be evident in the institution's organization chart but were crucial to the lives of people who populated the categories and acted out the roles? Would there be differences between institutions, at the level of basic values, sufficient to satisfy the diversity in attitudes, abilities, and interests to be found in the extended range of people, young and old, who are now seeking the benefits of higher education?

In the first chapter it was stated that whereas the diversity of form and function in higher education had been heretofore regarded as the chief distinguishing characteristic of the American system of education,[1] that system seemed to be shifting toward diversity in values, toward programs and institutions characterized by substantive differences in norms, styles and outcomes. Differences quantitative, it was suggested, showed promise of becoming differences qualitative; differences in degree were on the way to becoming differences in kind. And the challenge for educators was to become aware of such distinctions and, indeed, to accept them as a positive good. Now, in the conclusions, we are obliged to acknowledge that there was no widespread evidence, in any of the prime interest groups at colleges in the Institutional Character study, of commitment to value diversity to the point that such differences would not only be tolerated but encouraged, could not only survive but actually prosper.

---

[1] See Talcott Parsons and Gerald Platt, The academic profession (preliminary report) for a statement of praise for the supposedly differentiated system of higher education in this country. Also the Study of Selected Institutions, to be published by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Some students, faculty, and administrators showed interest in the creation of a system of higher education where various institutional models featuring different assumptions, values, and goals would be active and respected, but they were exceptions. Yet we will in this chapter be insisting that they were harbingers of change. Diversity in values as well as in organization and structure was a matter of growing curiosity and concern during the time of the study and seems just now, in 1969, under the pressure of various developments on campus and off, to be emerging as fact--not as an option for sentimentalists but as a necessity for national survival, not because of past practices but in spite of them.

Following are three conclusions of this study that relate to the subject of diversity and three bearing on educational change. Inferences attend each set.

I - The Absence of Holistic Planning

Most administrators and faculty in the project samples were giving little attention to and seemed to have only a minimal interest in the educational philosophy of their institution. They had no coherent rationale, no compelling vision for the college. Consequently, they found it difficult to answer questions about institutional goals or to describe their school's integrative value system.

There are, we believe, several reasons for the inability or unwillingness of faculty and administrators to think and plan holistically. Often their condition is caused by a lack of practice, growing out of a lack of interest, and resulting in a lack of skill. Faculty, oriented to disciplines and guilds, think of institutional goals in terms of their associations and priorities. Our research tends to confirm the frequently heard assertion that faculty are more likely to feel loyalty to their professional guild than they are to the institution in which they work. Administrators, also specialists, are busy with their particular functions and, therefore, have no time or preference for general goal formulation. Daily pressures force long-term considerations of this sort off their agenda. Therefore, like faculty, they are uncertain and uncomfortable when asked to take up the integrative, generalist role presidents and deans once played so actively.

In other cases, unwillingness to get involved in institutional goal formulation is due to a feeling of futility. Faculty and administration see the prospect of endless controversy in these matters and have no hope of achieving closure. Educators have not been able, viewed historically, to show the superiority of one educational philosophy over another--the idealists, from Plato to Hegel, took a stand for the primacy of transhistoric verities, for universals or absolutes, while the realists, from Aristotle to Mill, made the case for the dignity of men and ideas in and of this world. In more recent time came the perennialists, Hutchins and Barr; the progressivists, James and Dewey; the analytic philosophers, Wittgenstein and Russell; the existentialists, Kierkegaard and Heidegger. All these schools of thought and these philosophical theoreticians have been persuasive, yet they have failed to persuade, in the sense of winning a dominant position in the field.

Because educators have been unable to prove the superiority of one educational philosophy over another, or to incorporate several explicit philosophies in a given institution without fratricidal warfare, it has seemed expedient to many administrators and faculty to play down the whole business. A vacuum seemed better than a whirlwind.

There are three comments that should be made concerning what has transpired: First, the pressure of difficult problems has never been, in academe, an acceptable reason for the abandonment of the search for true answers. In the natural and physical sciences, complexities have been reason for the intensification of efforts to resolve them. Should not scholarship be as disciplined and persistent in the moral subjects as in the non-moral? Is it appropriate, then, that the quest for value certitude should be abandoned on the ground of rival claims and attendant difficulties?

A second comment develops a point made earlier. The absence of open commitments forming an integrative value system does not mean that there are no values or philosophical assumptions operating in the institutional context. Our research does not support the notion that a value vacuum exists on American college and university campuses. There is, to be sure, a lack of conscious involvement in or collective resolution of these issues today; but, as always, for institutions as for individuals, an educational rationale with attendant "behavior supports" is operating at all times. Nowhere do men teach just anything; everywhere they exercise selection, taking one thing, rejecting something else. And philosophical norms, consciously or unconsciously espoused, provide criteria for selection, continuation, and change.

To illustrate: colleges and universities have emphasized a "philosophy" featuring cognitive rationality. The superiority of communicating knowledge by rational processes has long been assumed by academics. Approaching the emotions by the mind has been favored over coming to the mind by the emotions. The goals have been: scholarly objectivity without running off into dogmatic absolutism, intellectual relativism without yielding to individual subjectivism.

There has also been general commitment in institutions of higher learning to certain class and caste values. Discrimination--racial, attitudinal, stylistic--has been and is rampant. Rewards and sanctions, the departmental organization of learning, professional specializations, the distribution of power within the institution, all these structures and functions have supported class or caste distinctions (Martin, 1969, pp. 47-48).

It is mistaken to say, therefore, that there are no shared values on American campuses. There are fundamental norms and various preconceptions that have made possible the program diversity that so much enamours us while encouraging a value conformity that may now be our chief threat. (Because most faculty and administrators have not been "stalkers of meaning," the educational philosophy of the school has been determined by the pressure of academic professionalism or methodological biases, by hoary tradition or anticipatory opportunism, by "service" considerations or the lure of external attractions.[2])

---

[2] Senator J.W. Fulbright has warned, as have others, of the consequences for the modern university when it strikes an "arrangement of convenience, providing the government with politically usable knowledge and the universities with badly needed funds....The price can be the surrender of independence, the neglect of teaching, and the distortion of scholarship." Fulbright has been especially concerned about universities betraying their fundamental purpose, which purpose is, he says, in the words of James Bryce, to "'... reflect the spirit of the times without yielding to it.'" (Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. II, No. 8, p. 3, December 21, 1967).

This condition has been coupled with an inclination on the part of administrators to cling, when pressed, to the socio-political values of the societal status quo. So far as we could tell from a study of "critical incidents" on campus in project schools, administrators accepted without serious question the fundamental assumptions of the Western liberal tradition which, after all, underlie liberal education. These assumptions have to do with man as a rational being; with community, consensus, and order; with certain ideas about the family, home, property, race, work, nationalism, democracy, free enterprise, science, and technology. The consequences of these commitments are that administrators think of change in terms of traditional conceptualizations of issues and of reform consistent with established values. They are not inclined to favor radical alternatives or think of reform leading to the transformation of conventional values, of evolution culminating in revolution. We found no substantive value diversity--political, social, or moral--among administrators. They were more uniform in their thinking than faculty or students. Our conclusion may be depicted in a pyramidal model of value diminution. Most open to value diversity were students; they are represented by the base line of the pyramid. There was less openness among faculty, and least among top administrators. Thus, value diversity diminishes as one climbs the institutional pyramid.

Finally, to say that there has been a paucity of conscious attention to institutional values and an excess of conformity to supra-institutional academic and social values, is not to say that this state of affairs must inevitably continue. Although administrators, faculty, and most students were poorly equipped and personally reluctant to talk about institutional goals, we sensed during the course of this study that certain developments in contemporary life, including those mentioned earlier, were prompting new concern for the purposes behind institutional programs. Social unrest, technological change, and especially the new youth movement, plus anxiety on campus about the relationship of institutions of higher education to these social forces, may now compel educators young and old to think contextually if not holistically.

The evidence of propensity to change was most apparent among students. Entering freshmen in our study showed concern for the social relevance of the program of the institution of higher education and seemed to have no trouble accepting the old-fashioned notion that a college or university should be based on heady idealism. Not that most students were daring or adventuresome with values or theory. Except for a small minority in most schools and a large minority in a few schools, students were conventionally oriented. Nevertheless, comparatively, they were in the vanguard of an emerging concern for educational philosophy and the basic purposes of higher education. And their concern seems to be having an effect on faculty and administrators. While students were the first to turn again to the normative questions, talking increasingly about what Dostoevsky called in The brothers Karamazov "the eternal questions," the questions of "...what do you believe or don't you believe at all?"[3] their insistent questioning is forcing older members of the academic community to give provisional answers to student questions if not final ones, certitudes if not answers of absolute certainty. The realization seems to be growing that where there is no philosophical framework, faculty as well as students lack an institutional standard against which to test themselves. Faculty need such a standard because they are at the stage of life when, as Erik Erikson put it, the issue is integrity, just as students need it because they are at the stage in life where, as Edgar Friedenberg has shown, the issue is self-identity. Neither faculty nor students can decide such issues in a void. When nothing is definite, nothing is definitive.

(A measure of the peril in higher education today is the fact that at a time when institutions as well as individuals are expected to have character, the experiences, habits, and paradigms of most educators have not prepared them for this kind of leadership. Thus, it is not at all certain that they can do what the times require.)

Our observation of an emerging concern for establishing fundamental values in the schools must be qualified not only with respect to students vis-à-vis faculty or administrators but also with respect to types of institutions. Interest in achieving a sense of shared purpose was more evident in the smaller colleges. In these places there was concern for precision in declaring goals and an awareness of their effects. At the older and larger institutions, conceptualizations about the nature of the university were either ignored or scorned by all interest groups while roles, functions, and structural forms were emphasized. The larger the institution, especially if under public control, the more educational philosophy and broad integrative objectives were written off as meaningless rhetoric or were thought of by respondents as matters beyond the control of administrators or faculty and set by the state, the constituencies, or impersonal forces within the institution.

---

[3] Dostoevsky used the phrase "the eternal questions" to refer to fundamental issues about the nature of reality. But questions of that order and social questions are, as the following quotation asserts, "the same questions turned inside out."

> ...Talking about nothing but the eternal questions...what do you believe or don't you believe at all?...of the eternal questions, of the existence of God and immortality. And those who do not believe in God talk of socialism and anarchism, of the transformation of all humanity on a new pattern, so that it all comes out to the same, they're the same questions turned inside out... (p. 277).

But this qualification needs further refinement. In the semi-autonomous, innovative colleges operating within large universities, knowledge about and concern for educational philosophy and integrative institutional objectives within that sub-unit and concerning the relationship of that program to the total enterprise was most evident of all.

In the preceding chapter, comparative data analyses of the "Radical" colleges (four out of five were semi-autonomous, innovative sub-units within established universities) versus the "Standard Bearers" were given on the item in the faculty questionnaire dealing with the attention given during job negotiations to institutional objectives compared with departmental considerations. Seventy-three percent of the respondents in Radical colleges compared to only 6% in the institutions designated Standard Bearers reported that general objectives were treated at length. Meanwhile, 54% of the faculty from Standard Bearers and a miniscule 1% of the Radicals said that the emphasis during job interviews was predominantly on the departmental specializations.

Students, faculty, and administrators in new colleges, including colleges under public auspices, become by the very nature of their situation quite self-conscious about educational assumptions, goals, and values, especially if their programs are located in close proximity to and in competition with other units of the same university. Their involvement with these concerns can act, in our judgment, as a prod toward the achievement of institutional character. The establishment of new colleges within the general structure of the existing institution provides a mechanism for confronting value questions and probing alternative answers. (There will be more on the subject of change later in this chapter.)

II - The Lack of Value Diversity

We turn now to the second component in the first cluster of conclusions. Contrary to the thinking of most educators, but in line with project findings alluded to earlier, substantive value diversity is not characteristic of American higher education. Diversity in organizational, methodological, and structural matters has led to confusion about diversity in values. So much has been made of differences between public-private, university-liberal arts, rural-urban higher education that it is believed that because people organize themselves differently they must be different in ideals and aspirations. A necessary distinction between operational diversity and value diversity is often missed--between what people do and what they aspire to be, between practices and the picture dominating their imagination.

That academics fill diversified roles is unmistakable. That they are affected by those roles is equally certain. But our data suggest that behind professional roles is a shared ideology by which institutional outcomes are judged and by which individual worth is measured. The attitude a man brings to his work influences how the work will influence him. This is a variation of the insight emphasized by left radical students when they speak of power being in the eyes of the beholder.

For academics today the undergirding ideology is professionalism or, as it is called, the "professional orientation," for which the autonomous research scholar is the paradigm. Faculty may be separated into departments and specializations, or by methodological preferences, but they are united in wanting to be professionals.

Administrators too have differing functions and perspectives. Academic administrators differ in emphases from, say, personnel deans. But behind these operational differences is a great similarity in basic values. They, like faculty, have areas of competence. They want professional acceptance. At the level of aspiration, values merge.

The same is true with the majority of students. Most seek, as observers have said, certification in the system. Many are willing to accept arrangements at schools that lead them into a life style patterned after the personal and professional values of faculty.

What we conclude, then, is this: when one looks at surface manifestations of campus life, at roles played and behavior manifested, there appears to be in American institutions of higher education a great deal of diversity--in programs, styles, objectives, even values. Those things that are valued, roles or relationships in the personal, social or professional realms, are confused with values. Value diversity is claimed on the basis of the multiplicity of things valued by individuals and groups.

But values, properly understood, operate beneath surface choices and act as criteria or normative standards. Beneath choices which are valued in the personal life is the normative value of self-interest; beneath social attitudes and actions is the basic need for social acceptance, the value base for that which is valued; behind professional roles and functions is the deep value, professionalism.

> ...it is not the fact of preference or choice but the standard in accordance with which it was made that really matters. And when this point is brought out into the open, the critical or normative aspect of the value situation is disclosed at the same time. For the value aspect resides in the criterion determining the critical response (Smith, 1959, p. 18).

Without getting into the issue of how people acquire their basic values--is it something in the family history, a matter of metabolism, a generic strain?--or into whether the justification for human values is ultimately rational or irrational,[4] or further into the unending disputes over Platonic "categories" and Aristotelian "realism," we assert that the commitments of faculty, administration and students show a lack of diversity and an excess of value conformity.

---

[4] In John Barth's novel, The floating opera, one of the characters, Todd Andrews, states a view that seems to hound all of Barth's heroes:

> The reason for which people assign value to things are always (not necessarily immediately) arbitrary, irrational. In short, there is no ultimate reason for calling anything important or valuable; no ultimate reason for preferring one thing to another (p. 238).

Perhaps the most significant research project reported in 1968, so far as the themes of this study are concerned, was the study by Edward Gross and Paul Grambsch entitled University goals and academic power. These researchers sent out a questionnaire listing forty-seven goals for American universities to 16,000 administrators and faculty in sixty-eight universities (1964). Each respondent (7200, 62% administrators) was to indicate on a five point scale how much emphasis he felt each goal received at his institution and, additionally, how much each should receive. Thus the questionnaire provided perceived and preferred goal structures.

The results of this study generally support the thesis resulting from the Institutional Character findings that there is a paucity of diversity and an excess of conformity across interest groups and among various types of institutions in American higher education.

Gross and Grambsch found "considerable congruence" between perceived and preferred goal structures, and, by inference, a high degree of satisfaction among faculty and administrators "that goals are receiving the proper emphasis (p. 110)." Furthermore, they found that the "larger universities in the sample pursue essentially the same goals as the smaller ones, whether bigness is measured by size of the student body or of the staff (p. 111)." Nor did these researchers find any meaningful differences when comparing rural universities with those in urban settings. Finally, said Gross and Grambsch, "administrators and faculty tend to see eye to eye to a much greater extent than is commonly supposed (p. 115)," and:

> ...the high degree of congruence that exists between perceived and preferred goals at particular institutions underscores the selective nature of our universities, their tendency to attract and keep faculty and administrators who are in basic sympathy with the goal emphases of the university (pp. 115-116).

The point at which the Gross and Grambsch study seems to differ from this one comes with their distinction between the "elitist" schools and the "service" ones--the "elitist-service dichotomy." They put it this way:

> ...with respect to the global characteristics of productivity (as measured by number of doctorates awarded and by dollar volume of contract research), prestige (as measured by ratings of quality made by a nationwide sample of faculty and administrators), and graduate emphasis (as measured by the percentage of graduate students in the student body), a clear pattern of relationships emerges, and it is similar for all three measures. Those universities ranking high on any of these measures manifest an elitist pattern of perceived goals: They emphasize developing the student's intellective and scholarly qualities; they carry on pure research; they see themselves as centers for disseminating ideas and preserving the cultural heritage. With respect to support goals, they stress those aimed at satisfying the desires and needs of the faculty, they tend to slight undergraduate instruction but to encourage graduate work, and they demonstrate a concern for position goals having to do with the top quality of the academic program and with prestige.
>
> Universities ranking low on these characteristics--i.e., those that are relatively unproductive, low in prestige, and lacking strong emphasis on graduate work--manifest a "service" orientation in their perceived goal structures: They give relatively great emphasis to such non-intellective student output goals as preparing the student for a useful career and cultivating his taste and to direct service and adaptation goals that involve giving the surrounding community practical help and maintaining the favor of outside agencies or groups. Each of the three global characteristics has its own peculiarities; the pattern is slightly different for each, but the basic antithesis is there in all three analyses (pp. 111-112).

From our perspective, these findings do not dislocate the presence of conformity at the level of values in higher education. We have not claimed that there are no differences among institutions in what faculty, administrators, and students actually do in them. That some colleges as well as universities are "service-oriented" is indisputable. That the values of the people there are predominantly congruent with what they do is the point in question. We believe, and indeed infer from much of the Gross and Grambsch data, that administrators and faculty at "service" institutions have institutional goals and professional interests akin to their colleagues at the elitist universities. At the level of aspirations, values merge.

The crucial distinction, as Gross and Grambsch say, is not between faculty and administrators or, perhaps, between types of institutions. It is "between the 'outsiders' (legislators, the state government, regents)--who though technically within the university actually share little of its day-to-day life--and the academicians (p. 115)." It is the outsider who defends the service or practical goals. The challenge for educators, then, is to take youth who have been under societal influences that do not mesh with those prevailing on campus, especially on the intellectual and academic levels, and bring students over to the values of academics. If there be doubt that this is the preferred goal if not the actual practice of faculty and administrators, consider Gross and Grambsch again: "According to our respondents, goals related to students receive relatively little emphasis at American universities today, the one exception being that of training students for scholarship, research, and creative endeavor (p. 109)."

But can youth be changed? Can colleges and universities change the values students bring to campus?

The review of the literature on the subject by Newcomb and Feldman (1968) showed that the conclusion of some researchers was that the college experience does help to effect change in "college persisters," moving these students toward autonomy, independence, and a tolerance for complexity, while other researchers have stressed that individual "predisposition" plays the focal role in any such development. The Trent-Medsker study, Beyond high school (1968), showed that youth who persisted in college were different from those who did not, but, as these authors said, "...it appears that college may provide the opportunity for students to grow who are ready for this rather than foster development from the beginning (p. 215)." It is not evident that one college is better than another in causing changes or that the college environment is responsible for changes effected.

Additionally, the changes in college persisters may have involved the substitution of one form of conformity for another. The youth put off conformity to the values of the system out of which they came, the home and general social setting, in favor of conformity to the values of the system into which they went, that of the institution of higher education. Employing our rubrics, it appears that students may put off allegiance to certification, social and professional, as defined in the societal setting, in favor of professionalism, as defined by the campus milieu.

Are college students really more autonomous or independent? To answer that question it would be necessary to test the extent to which students show autonomy or independence from the values of the system within which they find themselves--the campus situation. They may change somewhat in relation to their earlier connections and loyalties but such change does not mean that they are truly independent persons. Independence is a virtue earned in the context of available options and present influences. When students leave campus and return to the larger society the vast majority either revert to the values they much earlier brought to college or take up those of the educated power structure, that segment of the societal context into which they move at graduation. It appears that, far from being independent, students are usually dependent on the values that prevail where they find themselves.

There are colleges and universities that make a special difference with their students, in the sense of having value impact on them. They are the institutions that show substantive as well as procedural distinctiveness. In this country the perennialism of the "Great Books" tradition at St. Johns College, the ego-existentialism of Antioch, the neo-Thomist realism of some Catholic schools or the biblical orientation of certain evangelical Protestant colleges, even the unabashed pragmatism of certain universities, provide ideological contexts within which participants may come to grips with human categories of meaning--order and disorder, certitude and mystery, aspiration and human frailty. But, it must also be said that the handful of colleges unusual in values are tolerated by the established educational leadership as institutional "sports," the exceptions that prove the rule. And the other less distinctive places, while acknowledged as having a certain uniqueness, are seen as providing harmless variations on approved themes. There is, generally, an absence of value diversity and a plethora of value conformity to conventional criteria of institutional excellence--to what may be called the Standard.

III - The Maypole Dance (or The Dominance of the Conventional Standard of Excellence)

One of the assumptions of the Institutional Character study was that so-called conventional criteria of institutional excellence would figure prominently in the respondents' delineation of what went into the creation of institutional character. But we were not prepared for the dominance of these criteria in various types of institutions and their authority with a variety of interest groups, as revealed by interviews and questionnaires.

Jencks and Riesman reported in The academic revolution (1968), a study chronicling the rise and triumph of professionalism on campus, that they saw evidence of increasingly convergent goals adhered to by ever more similar means (p. 39). Their book reveals, we think, a case of means become ends. The emphases of professionalism were originally intended as means to ends other than themselves. They were meant to help realize institutional objectives set by a school's philosophy of education. They were to help men become what their ideal inspired them to want to be. An ideal is impotent without its instrumentalities, even as functions always operate in the context of assumptions. Hence, the conventional criteria of institutional excellence were intended to be nothing more than forms of implemental distinctiveness. However, now, those means have become ends. This happened because during the fifty years or more when the academic revolution was taking place, academics failed to give attention to assumptions and goals, to fundamental value formulations, and thereby allowed the resulting vacuum of purpose to be filled by those powerful and useful means that, taken together, are called professionalism--the means become ends.

Today, institutional character is defined and evaluated by professionalism's standard. In the colleges and universities of this study, institutional character was not set by a philosophy of education or by purposes and goals inherent to the institution, nor was institutional distinctiveness seen as the result of a commitment to innovation or experimentation. Most of the schools had institutional character of a sort, but what they had was provided by this suprainstitutional value orientation, professionalism. This condition was less noticeable among the newer and innovative colleges of the study but it was evident enough even there to allow the generalization to stand.

The consequences of institutions and persons being accountable to this norm are profound: Today a school's educational philosophy as well as any efforts at innovation and change are made to support the Standard. The "academic revolution" of the last fifty years is now a revolution become counter-revolutionary, bent on crushing rivals and blocking further change. Deviation from the norm is not tolerated because it would be a challenge to the supremacy of this new behemoth. The traditions of the West have for more than 2000 years favored some form of monotheism--and, still, in education, our god is a jealous god.

A related consequence is that academics are caught in a one-model box. That is true of faculty in public and private institutions, large universities and small colleges. They are mesmerized by the model of the "versity," in one of its three sizes--the miniversity, the university, and the multiversity. There is not nearly so much diversity at the level of professional aspiration as is claimed.

The conventional criteria of excellence were almost as strong among faculty in the newer, innovative colleges of our sample as in the older, more traditional schools. "Teaching in the area of specialization," for example, was regarded as "Very important" by over 85% of faculty respondents in the Standard Bearer institutions and by 72% of faculty in the Radical colleges. "Research and writing," another of the marks of commitment to the Standard, was deemed "Very important" to 69% of the respondents in conventional schools and to 61% of the people at innovative places. Our data suggest that, lacking alternative models, as is now the case, faculties at liberal arts colleges will press their institutions into professionalism and toward success as measured by the Standard as fast as the school's resources and their own persuasiveness permit, even as the majority of faculty in innovative colleges may be expected, when things get rough as they always do in prototype situations, to revert to conventionalism.

There are other effects emanating from the dominance of professionalism today, several of which figure in present campus unrest:

(1) Measuring institutional success by the criteria of the Standard--by cognitive learning, command of certain language skills, use of code words and concepts, a social style and a personal

manner thought to reflect academic values--has justified the corollary of ever tightening student admissions criteria, with adverse effects for the social mix and idea exchange capability of the institution.

(2) Students have been limited to a formal, even tutelary relationship with faculty due to the hierarchial organization of educational institutions. This situation existed prior to professionalism, when patriarchalism was the style, but it has been buttressed by linear, sequential ways of measuring learning and by the status consciousness of professors in the now dominant arrangement. Organizing life on campus for the convenience of faculty and administrators, an ancillary effect of professionalism, may have improved faculty morale and helped to promote order but it has had negative effects on student creativity and self-realization.

(3) Another consequence of the dominance of the Standard, a positive one in the eyes of most faculty, has been increased emphasis on academic freedom as conventionally defined in American colleges and universities. Professionals in all fields insist on a good measure of freedom, and therefore, in education as elsewhere, the security of academic freedom, protected by tenure, has become a feature of professionalism. (The first goal, on both the perceived and preferred sides, as reported by faculty and administrators in the Gross and Grambsch study, was the protection of academic freedom.)

(4) Another outcome of professionalism, a negative one, is that

educational costs have soared as teaching hours were reduced to add time for research, as various local roles have been replaced by guild activities, and as other features of the Standard were emphasized. If there were alternative models that could gain respectability perhaps many schools would not follow the present norm with its high costs for professionally-oriented facilities and faculties.

(5) The consequences of the Standard for the spirit of community have been negative because while the Standard provided a basis for a certain type of community (the fellowship of expertise), professionalism eventually divided campuses into compartments that fragmented the student's learning experience and confined faculty to the system's rigid categories.

Training for the professions and specific professional standards emerged, as stated in Chapter I, out of legitimate concern for both social and educational improvement. Now, however, the rise of professionalism in education which replaced the varied structures and functions of nineteenth century schools, has culminated in a value orientation that makes the credentialing process more important than true professional competency, equates schooling with education, and makes cognitive skills a form of technique by which "success" is measured. The legitimate authority of professional skill has given over to the authoritarianism of professionalism.

The metaphor for our condition is the maypole dance. Students, faculty and administrators today, in their varying garbs representing their several traditions, are all dancing around a common center. And as they clutch their ribbons and carry out the prescribed dizzying maneuvers, they seem blinded to the fact that they are dancing in an ever smaller circle and are reducing their individual freedom by binding themselves more and more tightly to the Standard.

IV - The Urge to Move--Prospects for Change

As there were three conclusions dealing with institutional goals and the suprainstitutional value orientation, so there are three dealing with the subject of change, more particularly with prospects for innovation and experimentation in American higher education.

An awareness of the certainty of change in American life has prompted, we conclude, a growing curiosity among all elements on campus about educational innovations and experimentation.

It now seems to be established doctrine that while human nature may be changing very slowly, the culture of the people is changing more rapidly, and societal changes are coming very fast indeed. Technology is transforming society and thereby raising challenges basic to the scholar's ideas about man's nature, the meaning of western history, and the relationship of man to the natural world. Because the school, including the institution of higher education, is part and parcel of society, changes now so evident in the societal context are affecting it. Necessity may not always be the mother of invention but it can encourage a lively interest in change. Educators are much like other people, they sit tight as long as they can and show "get up and go" when they must. Today with their chairs being jerked out from under them, they are beginning to feel the urge to move. Profound changes in the emerging technetronic age will result in equally significant changes for institutions of higher education , not due to the initiative of educators, but because of the institution's vulnerability to societal influences and despite the traditional conservatism of academics. Curiosity abaut those changes and willingness to test innovations in connection with them are emerging trends.

In the composite faculty samples drawn from the colleges and universities of this study, well over half of the respondents indicated a personal interest in the theme of innovation and in innovative practices and expressed a willingness to become personally involved on behalf of such developments. Sixty-six percent said opportunities for innovation were "Very important" to them, 28% called innovation "Somewhat important," and only 4% regarded such opportunities as "Not important."

Administrators interviewed showed an even stronger curiosity about change options as well as a high degree of professed commitment to effecting change. The same was true with the majority of students. What is alarming is that neither faculty nor administrators in any great numbers had knowledge of specific innovations, nor were they thinking about an appropriate strategy for change in institutions of higher education. They had no sense of the possible, no substantive acquaintance with changes being attempted elsewhere, and they were not sophisticated about the planning necessary for innovations to succeed. This condition was, predictably, more prevalent among faculty than administrators. The latter by the very nature of their work are more likely to be informed. Yet ignorance of change options and change mechanisms was a problem with both groups.

Our study supports the case made against faculty that they more than administrators are inhibitors of innovation, especially in the area of curriculum. And the reason, along with concern for vested interest and personal security, plus the inevitable dash of human perversity, is ignorance. Because faculty are unaware of what might be done they cling to the familiar. The following item was in the faculty questionnaire:

> In your opinion at what colleges and universities are the most promising innovations in undergraduate education taking place? (List not more than five schools, and try to list them in the order of your estimate of the importance of the innovation.)

Faculty were not given multiple choice response options but were presented two columns, one for the listing of institutions and the other for innovations.

Twenty-seven percent of 577 respondents gave no reply to this question, by far the highest no response rate for any item. Of the 73% who did reply, 17% said straightforwardly that they did not know enough about innovative institutions to attempt an answer, 5% named a school but no innovation, and another 10% gave variant comments of one sort or another. Forty-one percent met the specifications of the question and listed one or more colleges and one or more innovations. But even this group gave uneven answers, their responses were often vague, uncertain, or incorrect. After all due allowances are made--confusion and irritation with the form of the item or with the questionnaire, time pressures, indigestion and other disabling conditions--the conclusion must be drawn that faculty left to their own devices to list innovative places and programs deserve low marks. Indeed, they flunk.

Curiosity about innovation and experimentation is matched by ignorance of change options. But information can be supplied. Changing attitudes is the hard job. Yet we infer from our data that attitudes are changing.

There is, for example, evidence of self-criticism and dissatisfaction with established arrangements. Faculty respondents in Standard Bearer institutions, those places we regarded as most conventional, were more inclined than faculty in Radical or innovative colleges to feel that course offerings in their institutions were too specialized and that not enough attention was being given to the unity of knowledge.

These faculty were also more likely to agree that not enough emphasis is placed in their colleges and universities on shaping the moral and ethical values of students. (The Gross and Grambsch data revealed that respondents felt the university ought to be giving more attention to developing student character and citizenship.) Faculty in Standard Bearer institutions in the Institutional Character study also thought there should be less emphasis on grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements.

Because faculty are shaken by events on campus and off to the extent that their attitudes toward change is changing, we are prepared to contend that innovation may now be possible on a broad scale.

V - Limitations on the Extent of Change

We have distinguished between innovation and experimentation, using the word "innovation" to signify new means to established ends and having "experimentation" stand for new means to new or open ends. In the context of innovation, so defined, the basic values behind conventional higher education are thought to be sound and the need is for new and better ways of achieving them. In experimentation, the values underlying existing institutional arrangements are deemed to be inadequate and in need of change. The experimental idea implies the overthrow of the old order and the substitution of something new.

Today, neither in the schools of the Institutional Character study nor elsewhere do we see much experimentation. This is not surprising since institutions of higher education are essentially agents of socialization and almost never radical agents of social change. But we do see a promising future for innovation, for those changes likely to make colleges and universities agents of social change in the more restricted sense of refining and improving existing objectives and programs.

When the institutional samples for this project were divided into three previously discussed categories--the independent liberal arts colleges, called the "Libarts"; the older colleges of arts and sciences in universities sponsoring cluster colleges, designated "Elder Siblings"; and the new cluster colleges, or "Newcomers"--it was possible to distinguish gradations of interest in innovation among types of schools, although all types showed considerable interest in the subject. For example, faculty at Newcomer colleges felt that most of their colleagues would be willing to participate personally in educational change efforts, while representatives from the Libarts estimated that about half of their faculty contacts were so inclined, and the sample from the Elder Siblings thought that just "Some" of their peers would do so. These differences were significant at the .01 level with a chi square test.

The picture was reversed when faculty respondents were asked to scale their colleagues as to the proportion who were not hostile to innovation but were unwilling to get personally involved. The sample from the Elder Siblings said that this would be true for about half of the faculty they knew, whereas in the Libarts group this judgment was reduced to "Some," and in the Newcomers it was thought to apply to from "Some," to "Very few." The Newcomers differed from Libarts at the .05 level of significance with a chi square test while the difference between Newcomers and Elder Siblings was at .01.

These data show that new, innovative colleges had succeeded in bringing together larger proportions of innovatively oriented faculty than was true elsewhere. But it is also noteworthy that in the liberal arts colleges, and even in the established units of the universities, there were significant elements of the faculty who were regarded by colleagues as potential participants in change activities.

VI - Viable Forms of Innovation

Other data from the Institutional Character study suggest that certain specific innovative proposals are viable change options now.

Seven out of ten entering freshmen stated a preference for group discussions rather than lectures. Independent study also ranked high. An integrative academic program was favored by most students over a specialized one. To be sure, most respondents had only vague notions about what these innovations might mean for their future, and, furthermore, after a year or two on campus their attitudes would probably be modified by the lure of the Standard, but, nevertheless, the point remains that at entrance to college there was strong sentiment among students in support of discussion classes, independent study and integrative curricula. These innovations are, we submit, especially accessible beachheads for change.

It must not be inferred that the interests of entering freshmen regarding areas of viable innovation were the same as those of faculty. The faculty were more beholden to the Standard. Even the faculty in those colleges we regarded as innovative, the Radicals, were on a par with faculty in the Standard Bearer institutions at the point of the importance for them personally of an opportunity for research and writing. The only significant difference between the two groups emerged when respondents were asked to judge their colleagues on this same matter. Faculty at the Radical schools saw research and writing as "Very important" for themselves but only "Somewhat important" for their colleagues, while the Standard Bearers continued to maintain, in the rating of colleagues, that it was "Very important."

Another example that faculty were pretty much agreed on the conventional criteria of institutional excellence was seen in faculty attitudes, without differentiation by types of schools, toward that accepted symbol of excellence--faculty control of academic policy formulation. (At schools in the sample, students had advisory roles on administrative committees in some cases, full voting participation on student life committees in most cases, but active assignments on blue ribbon committees handling academic policy formulation in no cases.) Sixty-two percent of faculty respondents in the composite institutional total declared that students should not be involved more in academic policy matters than they were at the time of the study.[5] Yet it is also significant that 34% of faculty respondents favored some sort of change in governance.

It is also worth noting that many of the characteristics of a valuable educational experience as perceived by students were akin to those that educators have traditionally associated with liberal education--unitary learning, the spirit of community, integrity for the individual and human relevance in the curriculum. Given the uncertainty and general confusion that characterizes faculty thinking these days, when they seem eager for ideas that will revitalize the humanistic traditions of their institution, innovations that deal with these concerns may find a ready hearing from both faculty and students.

In this connection, perhaps the appeal for innovation should not in the future be based on faculty self-interest as has usually been the case in the past. That approach seems to have been carried to its nadir. The "soft" data gathered by our interviews and observations suggest that the educated are physically comfortable but not very happy; healthy in body but less so in mind, and still less in spirit; active, efficient, articulate but bothered by deep anxiety about the meaning of what they do. There is need among scholars and intellectuals to think again about what men ought to live for, about assumptions, values, objectives. Perhaps the new appeal for effecting change should be the renewal of an old appeal with the added dimension of relevance, the appeal to purpose. There is reason to think that it would get an active response.

---

[5] The goal of involving students in governance was at the bottom of both "is" and "ought" lists in the Gross and Grambsch study. The fact that their data were gathered in 1964-65, before the urgencies created by student unrest, may have contributed to the haughtiness of the "in" crowd.

Our data point also to the idealism of freshmen. They have an exalted notion of the nature of the institution of higher education and of what the educational experience should mean. That is important. What the student brings with him to college from his past in terms of aptitudes, learning experiences and personal attitudes, the "input factors" emphasized by Paul Heist and others as the most important variables for college success, should be balanced in research evaluation by attention to the forward looking attitudes, what a youth aspires to become (which of course is affected by his past) or what he thinks about himself, and by the school's level of expectation for him. A point of encouragement to us is that the youth in this study seemed to aspire, at entrance to college, to the achievement of individual character in a setting of an institution with character. Students believe that to learn is to change. Now colleges are learning that lesson.

Faculty in this study, while largely ignorant of change options and loyal to the Standard, also give indications of being attracted to certain innovations. For example, although team teaching failed miserably with our sample and must be regarded as an unpromising form of innovation for college level faculty tied to the Standard, respondents expressed interest in interdisciplinary teaching. Forty-one percent of the composite total called the opportunity for such contacts and teaching "Very important" to them personally, while 45% regarded it as "Somewhat important" and only 13% marked "Not important." It is true that there was considerable attrition in enthusiasm for cross-disciplinary teaching when respondents were reporting their ideas of what colleagues thought about that proposal, with the percentages dropping to 17% "Very important," 53% "Somewhat important," and 21% "Not important." Even so, these data encourage us to predict a good prospect of success for what is called at Sussex University 'relational learning"--where the disciplines are not scorned, nor are two subjects simply carried forward on parallel tracks, but where the subject-matter of the disciplines is studied "in relation" and taught by specialists. The informal dynamics, if not formal structures, seem to favor it.

Faculty also showed a positive attitude toward the concept of community. Here is another point where faculty and student interests touch. To be sure, the composite faculty response, with 30% declaring "community" to be "Very important," 50% "Somewhat important," and 12% "Not important," may have been skewed by a legacy factor--lingering sentiment for a lost tradition. Nevertheless, in a day when faculty commitment to professionalism is being countered among some students with individualism that runs off into radical subjectivism, with the consequence that standards are hardening into dogma on the one hand and settling into mush on the other, there is reason to note the leverage available to innovators who may be disposed to create new learning configurations featuring "community." We found support for a variation of a theoretical position long associated with Reinhold Niebuhr--man's potential makes community possible, man's frailty makes it necessary.

Administrators today are no less eager than faculty for viable innovations. Like everyone else, they play the referral-deferral game where declarations of interest in change are balanced off by complaints about being blocked by faculty or trustees or finances, by the lack of time and the need for the propitious moment. Nevertheless, administrators know that the future will be different from the past and they are beginning to sense that they have ways of shaping it. They complain that they have no cogency, that the power to effect change resides in the departments. However, student unrest raises threats to public good will--a problem area in which administrators have "expertise"--and the tactics of dissident students create conditions that embarrass faculty style and interrupt faculty work. In these circumstances we see a shift of power on campus in the direction of administrators, toward those who supposedly have the competence to deal with the trouble and who have the socio-political area as their domain. Faculty eagerly yield over unpleasant responsibility but with it goes considerable power. Thus, administrators come into position to give leadership for institutional change.

It is true that the values of administrators are basically conservative. They can be expected to show interest in innovation as here defined, but not in experimentation. They will be the first to become uneasy if programs committed to change turn out to be radically different. Administrators conditioned to the "administrative function," by which attention centers on continuity more than change, on harmony more than dissonance, are usually opportunists interested in diversity of means but not diversity of ends. But if they are opportunists, they now have their opportunity.

The innovation that provides the most promising opportunity today, the data of this study suggest, for administrators interested in promoting institutional change, is the cluster college concept whereby small semi-autonomous colleges can be established within the general framework of the large university or whereby academic sub-units are organized within colleges--the college within college idea.

Cluster colleges offer a way to change and improve institutions of learning by giving a new twist to the ancient maxim "divide and conquer." They may divide the masses of students into groups small enough to encourage identity and participation, thereby creating, as an additional benefit, a way for the absolute size of the university to increase while the working units remain small. And more, they can help to conquer that student apathy or hostility which grows out of a sense of powerlessness, by encouraging student involvement with the faculty in testing innovation, thus creating in the university a mechanism for institutional change without sacrificing order and tradition.

But more important than these reasons for establishing cluster colleges is the potential the concept has for the development and testing of holistic models that may prove appropriate for the future of higher education. While there is growing agreement that the pattern of the past will not be adequate for the future, not because the past was necessarily bad but because the future will be radically different, there is no agreement on what changes would be best. The option open is the structuring of alternative models where innovative or experimental probes may be carried out in the hope that the direction and mechanisms needed for learning in the future will thus become known.

When a few prestigious universities are setting the academic style and enforcing the Standard, the cluster college idea encourages the hope that these key institutions might now, under the developing awareness of current urgencies, spin off colleges commissioned to innovate radically. Substantive change would have a chance as the principle of growth through real diversity was applied in the centers of academic power. Two of the institutions in this study were of such stature and were, indeed, committed to innovation reaching to experimentation. The results of the study, where such colleges were operative, showed that the idea is a harbinger of hope. The colleges had the will to be different and were making a difference (Martin, 1968, pp. 69-134).

We find no reason to conclude that institutions of higher education are without resources with which to effect change. The human resources are there; interested faculty, students, and administrators comprise at least a significant minority of the whole. The hope for change is with a coterie of the concerned drawn from no one interest group but from across several of them, from students, faculty, and administrators willing to share responsibility for creating alternative models promising institutional character. Until such leadership and specific options are forthcoming, everyone will continue to live by the conventional standard of excellence and by it institutional character will be judged.

Even if the college within college idea proves valuable as a mechanism for testing specific educational options, and even if a coterie of the concerned emerge to provide leadership, there will still be the "criterion problem"--the perennial need for standards by which to evaluate organizational options and the ideas of new leadership. By what criteria shall proposals be judged, who sets them, and why--by what authority?

In this century, as we have tried to show, all aspects of the socio-political life of the institution of higher education have been subject to the judgment of an American orthodoxy, whose dogmas were sanctioned by the industrial-religious-educational elite. Meanwhile, life on the academic side in our colleges and universities has been under the control of professionalism and the conventional standard of excellence.

Now, however, socio-political orthodoxy is losing authority, especially with the young, giving way before a contextualist ethic, relevant for the individual and "validated" by the existentialist's defense of self-determination as a prerequisite to self-authentication. And academic professionalism wanes too, losing force because of the association of its emphases with a technological society and the threat of life as technique.

Certain effects of these changes are now evident. There is a tendency, on the socio-political side, to set aside college regulations supporting the concept of in loco parentis, to free students "to do their own thing." On the academic side, faculty still try to hold the line, insisting that conventional standards be maintained. But it is a losing battle, the outer defenses have already fallen--units of credit, time/learning equivalences, conventional grades, examinations, course prerequisites and sequences, SAT scores, I.Q. tests, and many other formal measurements of student potential and academic accomplishment. Challenges to the dignities of faculty and administration are no less marked, and no less successful. The old aristocratic-separatist organizational hierarchy based on titles, degrees, age, and office, is coming down and opening up.

These shifts, accommodations, and adjustments are not likely to end with superficial changes. That which is happening at the surface level bespeaks change at the deep level of fundamental norms. The emergent themes feature renewed confidence in the individual, increased anti-institutionalism, and the quest for a better basis for community. Yet, at the level of values, nothing is certain, except the evidence of substantive change. This is a day when the old ways are suffering the disarray of a retreat equalled only by the factionalism of the advancing new ways.

The criterion problem remains, whether the issue for the future is the validation with the young of the conventional standard of excellence or the selection of alternative guidelines.

It has not been the purpose of this author to declare criteria by which the institution of higher education in the future should be evaluated. But it is possible to state a conceptual framework within which to evaluate assumptions, values, and goals. It is a framework with two sides, one acknowledging the inevitability of value judgments, and the other emphasizing the provisional nature of all value judgments. To posit the inevitability of value judgments, and to proceed to establish certitudes, gives a basis for action and character. Coupling that process with the admission of the provisional nature of all value judgments keeps certitudes from hardening into absolute certainties, and keeps the institution open to change.

This approach should also help to overcome the problem confronting those colleges which in the past have found that their distinctiveness tended to become dogmatized, thus blocking further change. The very success of an effort can lead to its downfall. Mechanisms erected to protect the results of change can become barriers to criticism and obstructions to further innovation. The human tendency to absolutize achievements and assure their continuation by rules frequently transforms means into ends, as happened with professionalism.[6]

But the tentative nature of all value commitments, institutional as well as individual, would be a defense against the premature solidification of gains. Commitments would be understood to be real and obligating, but they would not be unchangeable. Criticism and creativity would have legitimate functions as the concept of process and the practice of change were institutionalized. In this way colleges and universities could have character even as they change and could make change a dimension of their distinctiveness.

---

[6] Robert K. Merton has described this development as "the familiar process of displacement of goals whereby an instrumental value becomes a terminal value." Merton, R. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality." A. Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, p. 53ff.

APPENDIX A

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

with Composite Institutional Totals (given in percent)

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

100 YEARS
1868 1968
A Tribute to the People of California

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

Dear Colleague:

This questionnaire deals with the theme of institutional distinctiveness in the present climate of change, and is intended to elicit faculty perspectives on related issues.

We know that it is difficult for a faculty member to contain within a questionnaire his views on matters as subtle and multidimensional as an educational institution's philosophy of education or a person's hierarchy of values, and yet, in a time of change, we must think about both purposes and direction for higher education. Furthermore, we must try to speak on these themes to others and learn from others. This questionnaire is an attempt without pretensions to make substantive communication possible, and thus we ask for your help.

The questionnaire is short, and you may prepare the booklet for mailing by folding over the back cover and sealing it. No envelope or postage is required.

Your responses will be anonymous. Numbers on the booklet are for coding the general data that will be made available to the participating colleges and universities. Several hundred faculty, stratified by rank and discipline, are participating. In addition, a student questionnaire has been distributed to the Freshman class and interviews are being conducted with certain administrators.

The Center for the Study of Higher Education was established at Berkeley in 1956. Since that time a total of thirty grants from private foundations, governmental agencies, and the University have assisted the Center in continuous studies of various aspects of higher education. In October, 1965, a grant from the U.S. Office of Education established the Center as one of nine major research and development programs in the nation, with special responsibility for the study of change and direction in higher education.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Leland L. Medsker

Leland L. Medsker
Acting Chairman
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education

College Identification

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the particular task for which you were being considered? (Please check one)

*(1)/1 16 Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed, at greater length than the particulars of the job.

2 22 About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job description.

3 15 The institutional philosophy and educational purposes were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.

4 40 The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would relate thereto.

If none of the options above is adequate, use the following space to indicate what happened in your situation.

(2) ....

2. The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for *you*. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for *faculty colleagues* in your institution. (Please check)

	Personal View			*View of Others*		
	Very important 1	Somewhat important 2	Not important 3	Very important 1	Somewhat important 2	Not important 3
(3-4) Many motivated, hard-working students	79	20	0	63	30	1
(5-6) A sense of community	36	50	12	25	52	12
(7-8) Opportunity for professional advancement	55	38	6	64	26	2
(9-10) An opportunity for experimentation and innovation	66	28	4	35	48	8
(11-12) Availability of research money and facilities	51	38	9	51	34	6
(13-14) An enlightened, skillful administration	70	27	2	48	38	4
(15-16) An emphasis on teaching	61	32	6	32	48	12
(17-18) Inter-disciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities	41	45	13	17	53	21
(19-20) Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.	66	29	3	45	41	4
(21-22) Opportunity to influence departmental policies	52	37	10	42	44	4
(23-24) Geographical location	33	48	18	21	59	9
Other (Please specify)						
(25-26)	....	....	....	....	....	....
(27-28)	....	....	....	....	....	....

---

*Ignore numbers in parentheses; they are for data processing purposes.

3. Give your response to the following statement:

"The duty of the faculty is to formulate the purposes and programs of the University. The duty of the regents [trustees] is to interpret and defend them."

— Robert Hutchins

(29)/1 80 I agree
2 16 I disagree
(30) If disagree, please specify

(31) Comments:

4. Should students at your college participate more significantly than they do at present in the formulation and implementation of academic policies, i.e., in establishing the content and organization of courses, on academic policy committees, by student-formed and student-led seminars?

(32)/1 34 Yes
2 62 No
(33) If no, please specify

(34) Comments:

5. What proportion of the present faculty do you consider to be seriously concerned, pro or con, with the formal institutional purposes that are intended to give direction and character to your college?

(35)/1 19 Almost all
2 26 Well over half
3 26 About half
4 14 One-fourth or so
5 7 Very few
6 0 Such things are not the concern of the faculty
(36) Comments:

6. In your opinion, at what colleges and universities are the most promising innovations in undergraduate education taking place? (List not more than five schools, and try to list them in the order of your estimate of the importance of the innovation.)

School *Innovation*

(37)/1 41%- School plus innovation listed
2 5%- School but no innovation
3 2%- Unspecific innovation; no school
4
5

7. What academic changes, if any, have taken place within the last few years at your present institution, within a department or of a more general nature, that seem to you to be significant innovations? (Please list in order of importance.)

(38) 44%- More than one innovation listed
13%- Academic strength
8%- New programs
2%- Image
1%- Facilities

8. Where have the initiatives come from for recent changes in your institution?

(39)/1 25 Faculty
2 15 Administrators
3 2 Students
4 2 External influences (state legislature, constituency, national agencies)

(40) ↓ **Comments:**
5 25 Faculty and administrators
6 4 Faculty and students
7 7 Faculty, administrators and students
8 2 Faculty, administrators and external influences

9. Do your colleagues express much loyalty for the history and traditions of this institution?

(If you are a faculty member at a new college established within the general framework of a university, apply this question to that university.)

(41)/1 46 About as much as faculties in similar institutions elsewhere
2 23 More than in similar institutions elsewhere
3 21 Less than in similar institutions elsewhere

(42) **Comments:**

10. What is your response to the following quotation?

> "In the United States . . . the major tide seems to be running heavily against innovation at the undergraduate level, less because of student conservatism, although this is a factor, than because faculty members are in such demand that they can set their own terms. Generally the terms include a reduction of hours spent with undergraduates, whether in the classroom or as advisers, and an unremitting effort preferably to teach postgraduate students and, failing that, to teach only advanced undergraduates—and to teach these in turn as if they were being prepared for graduate work."
>
> —David Riesman

(43)/1 60 I believe Riesman's point to be correct
2 32 I disagree with the point of the quote

(44) If disagree, please specify:

(45) Comments:

11. Which of the following goals of higher education come closest to *your own view* of what education should do? (Rank in order of preference, 1–2–3.)

(C.I.T.
irst preference
only)

(46–48)/1 8 Preparation for vocation or profession
2 7 Provision of knowledge, facts, and information
3 63 Development of the ability of the person to think and to understand the consequences of his actions
4 2 Education for character
5 10 Development of individual capacity for good judgment
6 0 Training for citizenship

(49) Comments:

12. Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present *faculty colleagues.*

	Personal View			*View of Others*		
	Very important 1	Somewhat important 2	Not important 3	Very important 1	Somewhat important 2	Not important 3
(50-51) Teaching in the area of academic specialization	83	15	1	72	17	2
(52-53) Cross-disciplinary teaching	27	45	25	10	46	33
(54-55) Student advising and counselling	44	41	14	17	53	19
(56-57) Faculty committee duties	10	61	27	14	59	18
(58-59) Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities	26	55	17	23	60	8
(60-61) Research and writing	66	27	5	48	36	6
(62-63) Team teaching	10	34	53	4	32	52
(64-65) Tutorials and other one-to-one student-faculty learning arrangements	42	41	14	15	53	18

13. What is your personal response to the following quotation?

> "For some decades now, in the humanities and in the social sciences, they [faculty members] have been preaching the dogma of relativism—ethical, historical, axiological, epistemological. On most of our campuses the dogma gets its most unequivocal expression in courses in philosophy, history, anthropology, and sociology. One finds it also in political science and in the fine arts. But when these evangelists of relativism are suddenly threatened in some value which they themselves deeply cherish, they are at once absolutists. It does not occur to them that the academic freedom and the pursuit of truth, which they so ardently extol, have been made meaningless by their own pronouncements. It is not a tyrannical administration, nor reckless students, nor scoundrelly regents that have shaken their strength. It is they themselves who have cut out the ground under their feet."
>
> —Robert E. Fitch

(66)/1 50 The statement is fundamentally correct

2 32 The statement is fundamentally incorrect

(67) If incorrect, please specify: ....

(68) Comments: ....

(73-78)

(80) 1

A-6

14. Here are some prevalent opinions on the programs of American colleges and universities. Check the category that best indicates the *applicability of each to your institution*:

	Strongly agree 1	Agree 2	Can't say 3	Disagree 4	Strongly disagree 5
(1) Course offerings are too specialized; there is not enough attention to the unity of knowledge.	10	29	8	41	8
(2) Not enough emphasis is placed on shaping the student's moral and ethical values.	8	18	20	36	10
(3) There should be less emphasis on grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements.	21	42	6	24	4
(4) Academic freedom should be safeguarded for students as much as for professors.	29	42	10	9	2
(5) More effort should be made to bring students and faculty together in unstructured, personal encounters.	24	45	8	15	2
(6) Insufficient emphasis is given to the validity of traditional norms for contemporary life.	6	17	30	33	9

15. Here are some ideas about higher education in the context of change. Check the category that best indicates *your personal* view on each of these matters.

	Strongly agree 1	Agree 2	Can't say 3	Disagree 4	Strongly disagree 5
(7) Colleges and universities, as institutions, must assume a larger, more important role in setting the goals and programs of our society.	27	44	8	15	2
(8) Too much emphasis is presently being placed on innovation and experimentation in higher education. Existing standards and arrangements are sound, and these should be achieved and utilized—not replaced.	3	17	12	48	17
(9) The concept of *in loco parentis* is unnecessary and undesirable because students should have the freedoms and responsibilities of adults.	15	38	11	25	3
(10) Although American colleges and universities provide diversity in organizational arrangements and degree programs, they show almost unvarying conformity at the level of social and ethical values.	6	31	24	32	3
(11) Course work should be more relevant to the social and political realities in the world outside the campus.	13	36	13	28	3
(12) Radical technological changes in our society necessitates radical changes in the educational experiences offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different.	19	40	11	20	3

16. Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how would you describe yourself in the area of religion?

(13)/1 ..14.. Deeply religious
2 ..33.. Moderately religious
3 ..28.. Largely indifferent to religion
4 ..11.. Basically opposed to religion
5 ..4.. Prefer not to answer

(14) Comments: ....

17. Following are four descriptive statements on existing student subcultures at American colleges and universities. While the individual student may participate in more than one, and while all of these groups are made up of individuals, the stereotype subcultures mentioned below do influence student values and, therefore, are important.

After you have read these statements, you will be asked to answer the following questions: First, which group would you like to see increased in size and influence on your campus? Secondly, which group do you find the most unrewarding to teach? Thirdly, which group is presently dominant on your campus?

(A) One subculture is made up of what Kenneth Keniston of Yale calls the "professionalists." These students value technical and professional competence above all else. They are academically committed so long as their studies advance them toward professional skills and careers, but they tend to avoid ideas and personalities that seem likely to disrupt their success formula. They often feel that they cannot afford the luxury of enthusiasm. However, within the context of their program, these students usually earn high marks—the reward for their diligence and fidelity to an unwavering purpose.

(B) The "fun and games" group, the collegiate subculture, is often criticized today, but it may be the only group still emphasizing the vivacity of youth and the importance of play. These students are not opposed to the life of the mind, they do their assignments, but they resist study programs that deny them ample time for physical and social pleasures. They will work hard enough to gain their diploma, but if they are to go "a second mile," they prefer it to be on a hike.

(C) A third student group identifies with the intellectual concerns of academe. The symbols of their values are the library, laboratory, and seminar. These students aspire to join the "intellectual elite" and are willing, in pursuit of this goal, to read deeply and widely, pursue ideas, and spend countless hours digging out information. They are not always practical, indeed, they are often visionary. The most creative scholarship is usually found in this subculture, but not the most successful group leadership.

(D) The fourth subculture is comprised of the gradations called the "non-conformist," "radical," "bohemian," and "disaffiliate" students. These students are often deeply involved with ideas and issues, both academic and in the larger societal context. "Humanness" is more important to them than grades, careers, or social acceptance. They are suspicious of institutional forms, including the institutions of learning, because they see them as a part of the "System" that controls rather than releases the individual. Though exceedingly critical, these students are not devoid of idealism. However, they do seem more concerned for an ethic of individual honesty than an ethic of social responsibility.

Now, assuming that all of these groups are represented to some degree on your campus, please answer the following questions by ranking each group 1-2-3.

	Professionalists	Collegiates	Intellectuals	Disaffiliates
	C.I.T. first choices only			
Which group(s) would you like to see increased in size and influence on your campus?	(15) 5	(16) 2	(17) 39	(18) 6
Which group(s) do you find the most unrewarding to teach?	(19) 11	(20) 23	(21) 3	(22) 13
Which group(s) is presently dominant in influence on campus?	(23) 17	(24) 23	(25) 6	(26) 1

(27) Comments: ....

18. Who would you say has the most powerful voice in determining the educational policies, i.e., the general objectives rather than the particulars of a given program, in your college? (Rank 1-2-3.)

(28-30) 0 ...5... Trustees or Regents
1 ...21... Chief Administration Officer of your *campus* (President, Chancellor)
2 ...18... Chief Administration Officer of your *program* (Dean, Provost)
3 ...1... Division Head
4 ...6... An Executive Committee. Please specify: ....
5 ...33... The general faculty
6 ...0... Students
7 ...1... Constituency
8 ...1... State-wide coordinating agency
9 ...2... Others. Please specify: ....

19. Please scale your faculty colleagues, as personal observation allows, on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of your college by checking one response for each item:

	Most 1	About half 2	Some 3	Very few 4
(31) Seem to favor "change for change's sake"	2	6	33	55
(32) Willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures	21	23	43	9
(33) Not hostile to innovation, but unwilling to get involved personally	19	31	35	11
(34) Hold to the principle that "nothing new must be tried for the first time"	2	8	17	65
(35) Believe that "if it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change"	7	10	24	49

20. What do you think are the most distinctive features of your college?

(36) ....

21. Have you published?

	None 0	One 1	Two-three 2	Four-six 3	Seven-ten 4	Eleven-fifteen 5	More 6
(37) Articles	0	8	16	12	10	8	31
(38) Monographs	0	10	10	3	1	0	1
(39) Books	0	20	12	4	1	1	1

22. List your discipline or specialization.

(40-49) ....

23. Highest degree held (check):

(50) /1 ...1... B.A.
2 ..13.. M.A.
3 ..77.. Ph.D.
4 ...3.. Ed.D.
5 ...3.. Other (Specify) ....

24. Institution conferring highest degree: ....
(51-58)

25. Present rank (check):

(59) /1 ...3. Instructor
2 ..31.. Assistant Professor
3 ..24 Associate Professor
4 ..37 Professor
5 ...2. Other (Specify) ....

26. *Years of full-time teaching,* prior to current year, at the college level, but without regard to institutions:

(60) /0 ...4... 0 yrs.
1 ..21.. 1– 3 yrs.
2 ..16.. 4– 6 yrs.
3 ..15.. 7–10 yrs.
4 ..13.. 11–14 yrs.
5 ..11.. 15–18 yrs.
6 ...5.. 19–21 yrs.
7 ...5.. 22–25 yrs.
8 ...8.. More than 25 yrs. (Specify): ....

27. *Years of full-time teaching at this institution,* not counting the current year:

(61) /0 ..9... 0 yrs.
1 ..26.. 1– 3 yrs.
2 ..16.. 4– 6 yrs.
3 ..11... 7–10 yrs.
4 ...6.. 11–14 yrs.
5 ...9.. 15–18 yrs.
6 ...4.. 19–21 yrs.
7 ...2.. 22–25 yrs.
8 ...5.. More than 25 yrs. (Specify): ....

28. What is your undergraduate teaching load during the current term?

(62) /0 ..15.. 0 hrs.
1 ..25.. 1– 5 hrs.
2 ..24.. 6– 8 hrs.
3 ..15.. 9–11 hrs.
4 ..17.. 12–15 hrs.
5 ...2.. 16 hrs. or more

29. Any comments about this questionnaire, or about other matters related thereto?

(63) ....

....

....

....

....

....

(73-78)

(80)2

Thanks for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

FACULTY RESPONSES (BY INSTITUTION) TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Question 1

When you were negotiating for your present job, was attention given through the correspondence, during the interviews, or in casual conversation, to the educational philosophy and objectives of the institution, particularly as compared to the details of the particular task for which you were being considered? (Please check one)

(1) /1.....Institutional objectives were treated at length, indeed, at greater length than the particulars of the job.
2.....About equal attention was given to institutional objectives and job description.
3.....The institutional philosophy and educational purposes were mentioned, but in a tangential or ancillary way.
4.....The emphasis was clearly on the work of the department and the way my own training and interests would related thereto.

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	NR**
CIT (577)	16***	22	15	40	7
South (22)	64	32	0	0	0
Southeast (15)	0	27	13	47	13
North (35)	14	29	23	20	9
Midwest (33)	12	67	3	15	3
UniEastern-A (51)	6	14	16	59	6
UniEastern-B (25)	4	20	32	40	4
East-C (42)	5	17	17	48	14
East-D (5)	100	0	0	0	0
West-E (38)	13	26	29	26	5
West-F (18)	78	17	0	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	4	13	15	60	8
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	36	36	0	7	21
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	50	0	0	25
UniWestern-I (94)	4	19	17	51	7
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	79	21	0	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	69	19	6	6	0

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(3-4) Many motivated, hard-working students

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	79***	20	0	0	63	29	1	4
South (22)	91	9	0	0	77	14	0	9
Southeast (15)	87	13	0	0	60	27	0	13
North (35)	91	6	0	3	89	6	0	3
Midwest (33)	97	3	0	0	88	9	0	3
UniEastern-A (51)	72	27	0	0	51	37	4	6
UniEastern-B (25)	80	16	0	0	56	36	0	0
East-C (42)	71	26	2	0	67	31	2	0
East-D (5)	80	20	0	0	80	20	0	0
West-E (38)	82	18	0	0	45	37	5	8
West-F (18)	89	11	0	0	83	11	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	73	26	1	1	56	34	1	6
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	71	29	0	0	71	29	0	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	75	25	0	0	50	50	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	73	27	0	0	60	37	0	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	100	0	0	0	79	14	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	100	0	0	0	69	12	0	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2 (continued)

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(5-6) A sense of community

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	36***	50	12	1	25	52	12	5
South (22)	50	50	0	0	41	50	0	9
Southeast (15)	47	33	20	0	13	47	27	13
North (35)	29	57	11	3	34	57	3	3
Midwest (33)	64	33	0	3	52	48	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	28	65	8	0	24	41	29	6
UniEastern-B (25)	20	64	16	0	32	48	4	4
East-C (42)	45	33	19	0	36	48	10	0
East-D (5)	100	0	0	0	60	40	0	0
West-E (38)	29	66	5	0	32	45	8	10
West-F (18)	44	44	6	0	33	50	0	6
UniWestern-G (151)	30	50	17	2	20	57	9	9
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	43	29	21	7	21	64	7	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	75	0	0	25	50	25	0
UniWestern-I (94)	30	54	15	0	8	58	24	2
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	36	64	0	0	14	64	7	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	69	25	6	0	31	44	6	0

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2 (continued)

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(7-8) Opportunity for professional advancement

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	55***	38	6	1	64	26	2	4
South (22)	50	46	4	0	54	36	0	9
Southeast (15)	87	13	0	0	33	47	7	13
North (35)	40	49	9	3	69	26	0	3
Midwest (33)	36	52	12	0	46	46	3	6
UniEastern-A (51)	67	26	8	0	71	22	2	6
UniEastern-B (25)	44	48	4	0	68	16	4	0
East-C (42)	60	29	12	0	60	36	2	0
East-D (5)	40	40	20	0	20	60	20	0
West-E (38)	32	63	3	3	32	47	5	10
West-F (18)	28	44	28	0	28	56	6	0
UniWestern-G (151)	67	30	3	1	76	13	1	7
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	29	43	14	7	64	29	0	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	75	0	0	75	25	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	63	34	2	0	80	16	1	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	57	43	0	0	57	29	0	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	44	50	6	0	50	31	0	0

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2 (continued)

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(9-10) An opportunity for experimentation and innovation

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	66***	28	4	0	35	48	8	4
South (22)	86	9	4	0	46	46	0	9
Southeast (15)	80	20	0	0	27	60	0	13
North (35)	40	49	9	3	34	54	6	3
Midwest (33)	58	42	0	0	39	58	3	0
UniEastern-A (51)	55	39	2	0	26	41	20	10
UniEastern-B (25)	76	16	4	0	32	40	16	0
East-C (42)	67	26	7	0	33	55	10	0
East-D (5)	100	0	0	0	80	20	0	0
West-E (38)	45	45	8	3	18	45	21	10
West-F (18)	89	6	0	6	44	44	0	6
UniWestern-G (151)	72	22	6	0	38	47	4	7
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	71	29	0	0	43	50	7	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	75	25	0	0	100	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	66	30	3	0	30	57	7	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	79	21	0	0	21	57	7	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	69	31	0	0	62	19	0	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2 (continued)

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(11-12) Availability of research money and facilities

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	51***	38	9	1	51	34	6	4
South (22)	50	46	4	0	46	41	4	9
Southeast (15)	67	27	7	0	27	53	7	13
North (35)	46	43	9	3	31	57	6	3
Midwest (33)	9	70	21	0	21	67	12	0
UniEastern-A (51)	76	16	6	0	63	28	2	6
UniEastern-B (25)	32	44	20	0	48	32	4	0
East-C (42)	31	50	19	0	17	67	14	0
East-D (5)	40	40	20	0	20	60	20	0
West-E (38)	16	66	18	0	5	45	37	8
West-F (18)	44	28	28	0	22	56	11	6
UniWestern-G (151)	70	24	3	1	76	13	1	7
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	21	57	14	7	79	14	0	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	50	0	0	75	25	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	58	37	4	0	66	28	2	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	50	43	7	0	64	29	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	31	62	6	0	31	50	0	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2 (continued)

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(13-14) An enlightened, skillful administration

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	70***	27	2	1	48	38	4	5
South (22)	77	23	0	0	54	32	0	14
Southeast (15)	93	0	7	0	33	40	7	20
North (35)	71	26	0	3	51	40	3	3
Midwest (33)	94	6	0	0	85	12	0	3
UniEastern-A (51)	71	29	0	0	49	33	10	6
UniEastern-B (25)	64	32	4	0	40	52	0	0
East-C (42)	74	26	0	0	60	38	0	0
East-D (5)	80	20	0	0	60	40	0	0
West-E (38)	76	24	0	0	34	42	10	8
West-F (18)	78	22	0	0	72	17	0	6
UniWestern-G (151)	62	32	4	1	47	37	3	9
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	50	36	0	7	29	50	7	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	75	0	0	0	50	50	0
UniWestern-I (94)	69	29	2	0	44	45	7	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	64	36	0	0	43	36	7	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	62	31	6	0	25	56	0	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2 (continued)

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(15-16) An emphasis on teaching

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	61***	32	6	0	32	48	12	4
South (22)	77	23	0	0	50	41	0	9
Southeast (15)	87	13	0	0	33	53	0	13
North (35)	63	34	0	3	57	37	0	3
Midwest (33)	94	6	0	0	82	18	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	55	35	8	0	24	47	22	6
UniEastern-B (25)	56	32	12	0	40	36	16	0
East-C (42)	76	24	0	0	55	40	0	2
East-D (5)	100	0	0	0	80	20	0	0
West-E (38)	82	16	3	0	42	42	3	8
West-F (18)	83	17	0	0	72	17	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	51	39	9	1	12	60	16	8
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	29	36	21	7	7	36	43	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	75	0	0	25	75	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	46	45	10	0	14	58	22	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	79	21	0	0	36	50	0	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	56	44	0	0	38	44	0	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2 (continued)

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(17-18) Inter-disciplinary faculty contacts and teaching opportunities

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	41***	45	13	0	17	53	21	4
South (22)	82	18	0	0	32	59	0	9
Southeast (15)	73	27	0	0	13	47	27	13
North (35)	31	51	14	3	14	66	14	3
Midwest (33)	67	33	0	0	46	52	3	0
UniEastern-A (51)	29	51	16	2	10	43	35	8
UniEastern-B (25)	28	64	4	0	12	48	28	0
East-C (42)	33	43	21	0	21	60	17	0
East-D (5)	100	0	0	0	80	0	20	0
West-E (38)	26	50	24	0	16	47	18	10
West-F (18)	83	17	0	0	61	22	6	0
UniWestern-G (151)	35	51	13	1	9	56	22	8
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	50	43	7	0	29	57	14	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	25	25	0	50	25	25	0
UniWestern-I (94)	23	55	21	0	6	56	33	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	71	29	0	0	14	64	7	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	75	19	6	0	25	56	0	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2 (continued)

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(19-20) Freedom in organizing courses, setting teaching schedules, etc.

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	66***	29	3	0	45	41	4	5
South (22)	73	27	0	0	54	32	4	9
Southeast (15)	87	7	0	0	33	40	13	13
North (35)	49	40	6	3	40	51	3	3
Midwest (33)	58	39	3	0	54	33	9	3
UniEastern-A (51)	71	26	0	2	37	45	8	6
UniEastern-B (25)	68	28	0	0	20	64	4	0
East-C (42)	83	10	5	0	60	31	5	2
East-D (5)	80	20	0	0	80	20	0	0
West-E (38)	74	24	0	3	26	47	5	13
West-F (18)	94	6	0	0	78	11	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	61	35	4	0	45	41	3	7
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	43	29	21	0	36	50	0	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	50	0	0	0	100	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	63	34	3	0	53	43	1	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	57	43	0	0	36	50	0	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	88	6	6	0	50	25	6	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2 (continued)

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(21-22) Opportunity to influence departmental policies

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	52***	37	10	1	42	44	4	5
South (22)	41	50	9	0	41	50	0	9
Southeast (15)	80	20	0	0	47	20	20	13
North (35)	49	37	9	6	40	51	3	3
Midwest (33)	54	36	9	0	64	33	3	0
UniEastern-A (51)	65	28	6	2	49	37	4	8
UniEastern-B (25)	56	32	12	0	28	52	8	0
East-C (42)	64	31	5	0	45	45	5	2
East-D (5)	100	0	0	0	60	20	0	0
West-E (38)	53	42	5	0	29	40	13	10
West-F (18)	50	33	0	6	44	28	0	6
UniWestern-G (151)	44	40	15	1	39	45	3	9
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	43	29	21	7	36	43	14	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	75	25	0	0	50	50	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	49	38	12	1	43	50	3	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	43	50	7	0	29	57	0	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	38	50	6	0	38	31	0	0

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 2 (continued)

The following are features of academic life that have a varying degree of importance for faculty members. Please rate them, first, in terms of their importance for you. Then rate them in terms of the importance you believe they have for faculty colleagues in your institution. (Please check)

(23-24) Geographical location

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	33***	48	18	1	21	59	9	6
South (22)	9	64	27	0	14	68	9	9
Southeast (15)	20	47	27	7	13	53	7	27
North (35)	20	60	17	3	11	60	14	6
Midwest (33)	3	42	54	0	6	73	21	0
UniEastern-A (51)	47	43	10	0	39	45	6	8
UniEastern-B (25)	48	40	12	0	24	52	12	0
East-C (42)	57	36	7	0	45	45	5	2
East-D (5)	0	40	60	0	0	40	40	20
West-E (38)	21	66	13	0	5	71	8	8
West-F (18)	22	44	33	0	6	44	39	0
UniWestern-G (151)	31	50	18	1	16	65	9	5
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	29	36	21	7	21	57	7	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	25	25	0	50	50	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	39	43	16	2	28	63	1	5
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	50	50	0	0	21	64	0	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	50	44	6	0	38	44	0	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 3

Give your response to the following statement:

"The duty of the faculty is to formulate the purposes and programs of the University. The duty of the regents [trustees] is to interpret and defend them."

--Robert Hutchins

(29)/1.....I agree
2.....I disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	NR**
CIT (577)	80***	16	3
South (22)	59	41	0
Southeast (15)	87	7	7
North (35)	71	26	3
Midwest (33)	70	21	6
UniEastern-A (51)	82	12	4
UniEastern-B (25)	88	4	8
East-C (42)	88	5	0
East-D (5)	100	0	0
West-E (38)	87	13	0
West-F (18)	83	6	11
UniWestern-G (151)	78	17	3
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	71	29	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	75	25	0
UniWestern-I (94)	81	17	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	86	14	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	88	12	0

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 4

Should students at your college participate more significantly than they do at present in the formulation and implementation of academic policies, i.e., in establishing the content and organization of courses, on academic policy committees, by student-formed and student-led seminars?

(32)/1.....Yes
2.....No

Institution (N*)	1	2	NR**
CIT (577)	34***	62	4
South (22)	46	54	0
Southeast (15)	73	13	13
North (35)	34	63	0
Midwest (33)	39	61	0
UniEastern-A (51)	33	65	2
UniEastern-B (25)	44	52	4
East-C (42)	24	74	0
East-D (5)	80	20	0
West-E (38)	53	45	3
West-F (18)	33	61	6
UniWestern-G (151)	30	64	5
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	21	64	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	100	0
UniWestern-I (94)	23	73	3
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	29	64	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	38	44	19

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 5

What proportion of the present faculty do you consider to be seriously concerned, pro or con, with the formal institutional purposes that are intended to give direction and character to your college?

(35)/1.....Almost all
2.....Well over half
3.....About half
4.....One-fourth or so
5.....Very few
6.....Such things are not the concern of the faculty

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	6	NR**
CIT (577)	19***	26	26	14	7	0	6
South (22)	46	41	9	4	0	0	0
Southeast (15)	7	0	47	13	27	0	7
North (35)	11	37	43	6	0	0	3
Midwest (33)	30	42	27	0	0	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	8	22	28	26	12	0	2
UniEastern-B (25)	12	20	24	24	8	0	8
East-C (42)	14	31	36	19	0	0	0
East-D (5)	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
West-E (38)	10	21	42	13	10	3	0
West-F (18)	72	28	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	13	24	26	15	9	0	11
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	43	21	14	0	14	0	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	0	25	25	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	7	24	27	22	10	0	10
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	57	43	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	50	38	6	6	0	0	0

*N = Number of respondents.

**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.

***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 8

Where have the initiatives come from for recent changes in your institution?

(39)/1.....Faculty
2.....Administrators
3.....Students
4.....External influences (state legislature, constituency, national agencies)
5.....Faculty and administrators
6.....Faculty and students
7.....Faculty, administrators and students
8.....Faculty, administrators and external influences

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR**
CIT (577)	25***	15	2	2	25	4	7	2	12
South (22)	9	18	0	0	50	4	18	0	0
Southeast (15)	20	13	0	7	13	7	0	0	13
North (35)	11	29	0	0	31	0	17	6	6
Midwest (33)	33	0	0	0	61	0	6	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	28	16	2	2	14	8	4	0	16
UniEastern-B (25)	36	12	4	0	8	8	24	0	8
East-C (42)	31	17	0	0	40	0	0	0	7
East-D (5)	40	20	0	0	20	20	0	0	0
West-E (38)	10	34	0	0	34	0	8	0	8
West-F (18)	11	28	0	0	17	0	39	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	25	16	3	3	16	3	4	2	19
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	57	0	0	0	29	7	0	0	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	0	0	0	25	25	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	30	6	7	3	16	4	2	4	13
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	14	0	0	0	50	0	21	0	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	6	19	0	0	31	0	6	0	38

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 9

Do your colleagues express much loyalty for the history and traditions of this institution?

(If you are a faculty member at a new college established within the general framework of a university, apply this question to that university.)

(41)/1.....About as much as faculties in similar institutions elsewhere
2.....More than in similar institutions elsewhere
3.....Less than in similar institutions elsewhere

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**
CIT (577)	46***	23	21	9
South (22)	18	46	23	14
Southeast (15)	53	13	20	13
North (35)	74	11	9	6
Midwest (33)	21	76	3	0
UniEastern-A (51)	51	12	28	8
UniEastern-B (25)	40	40	4	12
East-C (42)	40	24	31	2
East-D (5)	80	20	0	0
West-E (38)	55	26	13	5
West-F (18)	39	28	28	6
UniWestern-G (151)	54	16	15	13
UniWestern-J$_1$ (14)	21	36	29	14
UniWestern-J$_2$ (4)	0	75	25	0
UniWestern-I (94)	50	4	37	8
UniWestern-H$_1$ (14)	14	43	21	21
UniWestern-H$_2$ (16)	19	38	19	25

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 10

What is your response to the following quotation?

"In the United States..the major tide seems to be running heavily against innovation at the undergraduate level, less because of student conservatism, although this is a factor, than because faculty members are in such demand that they can set their own terms. Generally the terms include a reduction of hours spent with undergraduates, whether in the classroom or as advisers, and an unremitting effort preferably to teach postgraduate students and, failing that, to teach only advanced undergraduates--and to teach these in turn as if they were being prepared for graduate work."

--David Riesman

(43)/1.....I believe Riesman's point to be correct
2.....I disagree with the point of the quote

Institution (N*)	1	2	NR**
CIT (577)	60***	32	6
South (22)	64	36	0
Southeast (15)	53	27	20
North (35)	49	40	3
Midwest (33)	42	52	6
UniEastern-A (51)	76	18	6
UniEastern-B (25)	76	24	0
East-C (42)	71	21	5
East-D (5)	60	20	20
West-E (38)	37	47	13
West-F (18)	67	17	17
UniWestern-G (151)	57	36	6
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	43	43	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	75	0
UniWestern-I (94)	68	26	4
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	79	14	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	69	25	6

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 11

Which of the following goals of higher education come closest to your own view of what education should do? (Note: Respondents were asked to rank options in order of preference, 1-2-3, but first choice only is given here.)

(46)/1.....Preparation for vocation or profession
2.....Provision of knowledge, facts, and information
3.....Development of the ability of the person to think and to understand the consequences of his actions
4.....Education for character
5.....Development of individual capacity for good judgment
6.....Training for citizenship

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	6	NR**
CIT (577)	8***	7	63	2	10	0	4
South (22)	0	4	64	4	14	0	9
Southeast (15)	27	13	40	0	13	0	0
North (35)	3	14	63	0	6	0	9
Midwest (33)	3	0	85	3	0	0	3
UniEastern-A (51)	6	4	71	0	16	0	0
UniEastern-B (25)	4	4	76	0	4	0	4
East-C (42)	0	14	64	0	19	2	0
East-D (5)	0	0	100	0	0	0	0
West-E (38)	8	3	63	0	16	3	0
West-F (18)	0	0	61	0	17	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	11	8	61	1	11	0	3
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	7	21	57	7	0	0	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	50	25	0	0	0	25
UniWestern-I (94)	13	6	57	6	7	0	6
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	0	71	0	0	0	29
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	6	38	6	12	0	25

---

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 12

Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.

(50-51) Teaching in the area of academic specialization

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	83***	15	1	0	72	17	2	6
South (22)	86	14	0	0	59	18	9	9
Southeast (15)	87	7	7	0	73	7	0	20
North (35)	77	20	0	3	83	11	3	3
Midwest (33)	79	21	0	0	79	18	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	71	22	4	0	63	18	4	12
UniEastern-B (25)	92	8	0	0	84	4	0	0
East-C (42)	83	14	0	0	88	10	0	0
East-D (5)	60	40	0	0	80	20	0	0
West-E (38)	95	5	0	0	71	18	3	5
West-F (18)	44	44	6	0	44	39	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	87	11	1	1	68	20	1	5
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	86	14	0	0	64	14	7	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	100	0	0	0	50	50	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	85	11	3	1	71	19	2	5
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	79	21	0	0	86	0	0	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	81	19	0	0	75	6	0	12

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 12 (continued)

Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.

(52-53) Cross-disciplinary teaching

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	27***	45	25	2	10	46	33	6
South (22)	64	32	4	0	27	41	18	9
Southeast (15)	40	40	13	7	7	40	27	27
North (35)	20	43	34	3	3	63	31	3
Midwest (33)	36	58	3	3	12	70	9	3
UniEastern-A (51)	22	37	37	0	6	26	57	8
UniEastern-B (25)	20	60	20	0	4	44	44	0
East-C (42)	17	52	26	0	2	55	36	2
East-D (5)	60	40	0	0	60	20	20	0
West-E (38)	24	40	34	3	16	42	34	5
West-F (18)	78	11	6	0	28	50	6	0
UniWestern-G (151)	23	46	28	3	11	43	35	5
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	36	43	21	0	7	43	36	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	25	50	0	50	0	50	0
UniWestern-I (94)	19	50	28	3	2	47	40	6
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	36	57	7	0	21	50	14	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	38	50	12	0	25	50	6	12

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses show in percentage.

Question 12 (continued)

Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.

(54-55) Student advising and counselling

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	44***	41	14	1	17	53	19	6
South (22)	77	23	0	0	32	54	0	9
Southeast (15)	73	20	7	0	13	53	7	27
North (35)	51	40	6	3	20	66	11	3
Midwest (33)	61	39	0	0	42	46	3	0
UniEastern-A (51)	26	41	29	0	20	37	31	6
UniEastern-B (25)	28	52	20	0	8	72	12	0
East-C (42)	57	29	14	0	29	57	12	2
East-D (5)	60	40	0	0	60	40	0	0
West-E (38)	47	37	13	3	16	58	16	8
West-F (18)	33	50	11	6	28	61	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	48	40	11	0	13	54	20	6
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	43	29	29	0	7	50	29	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	75	25	0	0	75	25	0
UniWestern-I (94)	30	48	20	1	4	44	43	5
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	36	57	7	0	7	64	7	14
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	38	56	6	0	12	69	0	12

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 12 (continued)

Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.

(56-57) Faculty committee duties

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	10***	61	27	1	14	59	18	6
South (22)	4	54	41	0	4	59	23	9
Southeast (15)	20	53	27	0	33	20	27	20
North (35)	3	69	26	3	9	66	20	6
Midwest (33)	18	64	18	0	21	67	6	0
UniEastern-A (51)	10	47	37	2	14	47	26	10
UniEastern-B (25)	8	68	24	0	12	64	16	0
East-C (42)	5	60	33	0	19	60	19	2
East-D (5)	0	40	60	0	0	40	60	0
West-E (38)	5	60	34	0	18	55	16	8
West-F (18)	6	67	28	0	6	78	6	0
UniWestern-G (151)	15	61	23	1	16	64	11	4
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	7	29	50	7	0	43	29	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	75	25	0	25	25	50	0
UniWestern-I (94)	7	69	23	0	8	60	24	4
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	14	71	14	0	0	71	7	14
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	6	69	19	6	19	50	12	12

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 12 (continued)

Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.

(58-59) Professional meetings and attendant responsibilities

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	26***	55	17	1	23	60	8	6
South (22)	14	68	18	0	18	64	0	14
Southeast (15)	60	33	7	0	27	47	7	20
North (35)	34	51	9	6	14	71	11	3
Midwest (33)	30	54	12	3	36	52	6	3
UniEastern-A (51)	22	55	16	4	16	67	4	10
UniEastern-B (25)	20	56	24	0	16	64	12	0
East-C (42)	12	67	21	0	10	71	17	2
East-D (5)	20	60	20	0	0	60	40	0
West-E (38)	32	55	13	0	8	66	18	5
West-F (18)	17	33	44	0	33	39	11	11
UniWestern-G (151)	31	52	17	1	31	57	3	4
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	21	43	36	0	21	50	14	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	100	0	0	50	50	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	27	61	13	0	29	55	8	5
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	14	57	29	0	29	57	0	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	19	50	31	0	0	69	12	12

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 12 (continued)

Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.

(60-61) Research and writing

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	66***	27	5	1	48	36	6	5
South (22)	54	46	0	0	18	68	0	9
Southeast (15)	60	27	13	0	13	60	7	20
North (35)	49	43	3	6	17	63	14	6
Midwest (33)	30	48	21	0	21	67	6	0
UniEastern-A (51)	78	12	2	4	59	24	4	8
UniEastern-B (25)	64	32	4	0	32	52	8	0
East-C (42)	57	40	2	0	26	64	5	2
East-D (5)	0	80	0	0	0	60	20	0
West-E (38)	32	58	10	0	5	55	32	5
West-F (18)	50	33	17	0	22	56	11	0
UniWestern-G (151)	77	20	1	1	71	18	1	5
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	100	0	0	0	71	14	0	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	76	16	6	1	70	17	4	5
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	79	21	0	0	64	21	0	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	81	12	0	6	50	31	0	12

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 12 (continued)

Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.

(62-63) Team teaching

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	10***	34	53	2	4	32	52	7
South (22)	27	50	23	0	14	41	32	9
Southeast (15)	20	60	20	0	13	40	27	20
North (35)	3	20	74	3	0	23	74	3
Midwest (33)	27	42	24	6	6	48	30	3
UniEastern-A (51)	10	28	53	6	2	16	63	14
UniEastern-B (25)	4	36	56	0	0	20	68	0
East-C (42)	12	14	69	0	2	24	64	7
East-D (5)	20	40	40	0	0	40	60	0
West-E (38)	10	40	47	3	0	42	50	5
West-F (18)	11	61	28	0	6	72	11	0
UniWestern-G (151)	9	30	60	1	5	33	51	5
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	14	29	50	0	0	29	50	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	75	25	0	25	25	50	0
UniWestern-I (94)	4	35	55	3	2	27	60	6
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	7	36	57	0	0	29	57	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	6	31	56	6	12	31	38	12

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 12 (continued)

Following you will find a list of many interests and responsibilities that engage the efforts of faculty members in American colleges and universities. Please rate them, first, in terms of their theoretical importance for you (as opposed to your actual teaching situation). Then rate them according to what you believe to be their theoretical importance in the thinking of your present faculty colleagues.

(64-65) Tutorials and other one-to-one student-faculty learning arrangements

1.....Very important
2.....Somewhat important
3.....Not important

	Personal View				View of Others			
Institution (N*)	1	2	3	NR**	1	2	3	NR
CIT (577)	42***	41	14	1	15	53	18	8
South (22)	73	23	4	0	9	64	9	14
Southeast (15)	53	40	7	0	20	33	13	33
North (35)	31	51	14	3	23	66	9	3
Midwest (33)	33	54	12	0	21	54	18	0
UniEastern-A (51)	41	33	16	6	10	47	26	12
UniEastern-B (25)	36	44	16	0	8	64	16	0
East-C (42)	31	50	19	0	10	57	31	2
East-D (5)	80	20	0	0	60	20	20	0
West-E (38)	34	55	10	0	8	71	10	8
West-F (18)	61	33	6	0	44	44	0	6
UniWestern-G (151)	40	38	19	1	14	50	22	6
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	43	29	14	7	7	43	29	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	50	0	0	25	75	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	42	43	14	1	14	52	19	10
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	50	43	7	0	36	43	7	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	56	31	6	6	19	50	6	12

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 13

What is your personal response to the following quotation?

"For some decades now, in the humanities and in the social sciences, they /faculty members/ have been preaching the dogma of relativism--ethical, historical, axiological, epistemological. On most of our campuses the dogma gets its most unequivocal expression in courses in philosophy, history, anthropology, and sociology. One finds it also in political science and in the fine arts. But when these evangelists of relativism are suddenly threatened in some value which they themselves deeply cherish, they are at once absolutists. It does not occur to them that the academic freedom and the pursuit of truth, which they so ardently extol, have been made meaningless by their own pronouncements. It is not a tyrannical administration, nor reckless students, nor scoundrelly regents that have shaken their strength. It is they themselves who have cut out the ground under their feet."

--Robert E. Fitch

(66)/1.....The statement is fundamentally correct
2.....The statement is fundamentally incorrect

Institution (N*)	1	2	NR**
CIT (577)	50***	32	16
South (22)	50	36	4
Southeast (15)	73	0	27
North (35)	46	34	17
Midwest (33)	54	39	6
UniEastern-A (51)	49	29	14
UniEastern-B (25)	36	44	12
East-C (42)	57	26	14
East-D (5)	80	0	20
West-E (38)	54	27	19
West-F (18)	33	56	6
UniWestern-G (151)	56	22	20
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	29	43	29
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	75	0
UniWestern-I (94)	44	36	19
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	43	50	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	38	56	6

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 14

Here are some prevalent opinions on the programs of American colleges and universities. Check the category that best indicates the applicability of each to your institution.

(1) Course offerings are too specialized; there is not enough attention to the unity of knowledge.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	10***	29	8	41	8	1
South (22)	4	14	0	50	32	0
Southeast (15)	27	33	7	20	0	13
North (35)	3	29	3	60	0	3
Midwest (33)	3	18	6	58	15	0
UniEastern-A (51)	14	33	8	35	2	4
UniEastern-B (25)	24	28	16	20	0	4
East-C (42)	7	36	5	38	12	0
East-D (5)	40	0	0	20	40	0
West-E (38)	13	32	10	42	3	0
West-F (18)	17	11	0	56	17	0
UniWestern-G (151)	11	36	8	40	4	0
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	0	7	64	14	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	0	0	100	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	10	35	13	35	3	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	7	14	57	21	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	19	6	25	38	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 14 (continued)

Here are some prevalent opinions on the programs of American colleges and universities. Check the category that best indicates the applicability of each to your institution.

(2) Not enough emphasis is placed on shaping the student's moral and ethical values.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	8***	18	20	36	10	2
South (22)	4	14	14	64	4	0
Southeast (15)	20	13	53	13	0	0
North (35)	0	17	20	46	11	3
Midwest (33)	3	6	9	48	30	3
UniEastern-A (51)	6	20	22	33	8	4
UniEastern-B (25)	4	24	16	32	4	4
East-C (42)	10	17	26	38	7	2
East-D (5)	20	0	0	40	20	0
West-E (38)	13	29	18	26	10	0
West-F (18)	17	0	6	44	11	0
UniWestern-G (151)	12	24	21	26	11	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	7	0	7	50	14	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	0	0	75	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	7	20	20	40	7	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	7	14	43	21	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	0	38	44	6	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR= No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage

Question 14 (continued)

Here are some prevalent opinions on the programs of American colleges and universities. Check the category that best indicates the applicability of each to your institution.

(3) There should be less emphasis on grades, units of credit, and rigid course requirements.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	21***	42	6	24	4	1
South (22)	4	27	0	59	4	0
Southeast (15)	13	40	20	20	7	0
North (35)	23	23	6	40	6	3
Midwest (33)	12	67	15	6	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	29	41	4	18	0	4
UniEastern-B (25)	40	40	4	12	0	4
East-C (42)	31	38	10	19	2	0
East-D (5)	20	60	0	20	0	0
West-E (38)	21	55	5	13	3	0
West-F (18)	17	39	0	33	6	0
UniWestern-G (151)	18	46	3	27	1	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	29	29	0	21	7	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	25	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	23	44	7	22	2	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	21	0	36	29	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	12	12	6	19	31	0

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 14 (continued)

Here are some prevalent opinions on the programs of American colleges and universities. Check the category that best indicates the applicability of each to your institution.

(4) Academic freedom should be safeguarded for students as much as for professors.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	29***	42	10	9	2	1
South (22)	23	46	14	14	4	0
Southeast (15)	40	27	27	0	7	0
North (35)	31	51	3	6	3	3
Midwest (33)	24	54	18	3	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	37	37	8	6	0	4
UniEastern-B (25)	36	36	0	0	4	4
East-C (42)	38	33	12	7	5	2
East-D (5)	20	80	0	0	0	0
West-E (38)	32	50	5	5	0	0
West-F (18)	22	33	11	17	11	0
UniWestern-G (151)	27	43	11	11	1	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	7	43	14	7	0	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	50	0	25	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	27	42	10	13	0	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	29	36	14	14	7	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	25	38	6	12	6	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 14 (continued)

Here are some prevalent opinions on the programs of American colleges and universities. Check the category that best indicates the applicability of each to your institution.

(5) More effort should be made to bring students and faculty together in unstructured, personal encounters.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	24***	45	8	15	2	1
South (22)	14	68	4	14	0	0
Southeast (15)	40	40	20	0	0	0
North (35)	17	57	6	6	9	3
Midwest (33)	27	46	12	12	3	0
UniEastern-A (51)	22	43	6	16	2	4
UniEastern-B (25)	20	52	4	24	0	0
East-C (42)	33	43	2	17	0	0
East-D (5)	60	20	0	0	0	0
West-E (38)	32	47	0	21	0	0
West-F (18)	28	28	11	22	11	0
UniWestern-G (151)	30	45	11	11	2	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	14	29	7	29	0	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	50	0	25	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	18	47	11	15	0	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	7	36	7	29	14	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	38	12	25	6	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 14 (continued)

Here are some prevalent opinions on the programs of American colleges and universities. Check the category that best indicates the applicability of each to your institution.

(6) Insufficient emphasis is given to the validity of traditional norms for contemporary life.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	6***	16	30	33	9	2
South (22)	4	18	27	46	0	0
Southeast (15)	13	0	73	7	7	0
North (35)	0	9	40	43	0	3
Midwest (33)	3	12	27	52	6	0
UniEastern-A (51)	6	20	28	24	12	6
UniEastern-B (25)	12	12	32	36	8	0
East-C (42)	7	14	26	29	17	5
East-D (5)	0	20	20	60	0	0
West-E (38)	8	18	29	24	8	8
West-F (18)	6	22	11	50	6	0
UniWestern-G (151)	8	23	28	29	7	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	7	43	14	14	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	25	0	50	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	5	12	33	33	11	0
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	21	21	43	14	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	6	12	12	38	19	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 15

Here are some ideas about higher education in the context of change. Check the category that best indicates your personal view on each of these matters.

(7) Colleges and universities, as institutions, must assume a larger, more important role in setting the goals and programs of our society.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	27***	44	8	15	2	2
South (22)	27	54	0	14	0	0
Southeast (15)	47	40	13	0	0	0
North (35)	23	40	6	23	0	6
Midwest (33)	30	46	6	15	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	28	49	8	6	0	4
UniEastern-B (25)	24	36	12	16	4	4
East-C (42)	26	38	10	21	0	0
East-E (5)	40	60	0	0	0	0
West-E (38)	24	42	10	16	3	3
West-F (18)	39	44	11	0	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	26	43	9	16	3	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	36	36	0	7	0	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	25	0	50	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	21	48	7	18	2	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	29	43	14	14	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	38	31	6	6	0	6

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 15 (continued)

Here are some ideas about higher education in the context of change. Check the category that best indicates your personal view on each of these matters.

(8) Too much emphasis is presently being placed on innovation and experimentation in higher education. Existing standards and arrangements are sound, and these should be achieved and utilized--not replaced.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	3***	17	12	48	17	1
South (22)	0	4	0	54	41	0
Southeast (15)	0	40	20	33	7	0
North (35)	0	9	11	57	17	3
Midwest (33)	0	9	3	70	15	0
UniEastern-A (51)	4	22	6	49	14	2
UniEastern-B (25)	0	16	16	48	16	0
East-C (42)	5	12	19	43	17	0
East-D (5)	0	0	20	40	40	0
West-E (38)	8	32	16	34	8	3
West-F (18)	0	6	6	50	33	0
UniWestern-G (151)	4	19	15	46	14	0
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	36	0	43	7	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	50	0	50	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	3	17	12	48	17	2
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	0	14	50	36	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	6	6	44	31	0

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 15 (continued)

Here are some ideas about higher education in the context of change. Check the category that best indicates your personal view on each of these matters.

(9) The concept of in loco parentis is unnecessary and undesirable because students should have the freedoms and responsibilities of adults.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	15***	38	11	25	3	2
South (22)	18	59	4	18	0	0
Southeast (15)	13	33	33	13	0	7
North (35)	6	46	11	34	0	3
Midwest (33)	9	15	9	61	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	16	43	10	20	0	2
UniEastern-B (25)	16	48	12	16	0	0
East-C (42)	12	29	21	33	2	0
East-D (5)	0	60	40	0	0	0
West-E (38)	5	40	5	42	5	3
West-F (18)	39	33	6	6	6	0
UniWestern-G (151)	17	33	9	25	7	3
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	14	36	7	7	0	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	50	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	15	44	10	20	3	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	29	29	14	21	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	19	56	0	6	0	6

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 15 (continued)

Here are some ideas about higher education in the context of change. Check the category that best indicates your personal view on each of these matters.

(10) Although American colleges and universities provide diversity in organizational arrangements and degree programs, they show almost unvarying conformity at the level of social and ethical values.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	6***	30	24	32	3	2
South (22)	4	46	9	36	0	0
Southeast (15)	13	40	27	20	0	0
North (35)	0	26	17	43	3	3
Midwest (33)	6	30	21	39	3	0
UniEastern-A (51)	4	35	14	37	2	4
UniEastern-B (25)	8	36	24	28	0	0
East-C (42)	10	36	24	29	2	0
East-D (5)	0	60	20	20	0	0
West-E (38)	0	42	24	26	0	8
West-F (18)	22	39	11	17	6	6
UniWestern-G (151)	7	26	32	28	4	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	14	14	7	36	0	21
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	25	0	75	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	1	21	30	37	5	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	7	36	7	50	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	31	38	19	0	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 15 (continued)

Here are some ideas about higher education in the context of change. Check the category that best indicates your personal view on each of these matters.

(11) Course work should be more relevant to the social and political realities in the world outside the campus.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	12***	36	13	28	3	1
South (22)	23	68	0	9	0	0
Southeast (15)	33	27	20	20	0	0
North (35)	9	37	11	26	3	3
Midwest (33)	9	54	24	12	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	20	24	12	26	6	4
UniEastern-B (25)	4	48	12	24	4	0
East-C (42)	19	26	12	36	7	0
East-D (5)	20	0	60	0	0	0
West-E (38)	16	42	10	18	3	3
West-F (18)	6	56	11	11	6	0
UniWestern-G (151)	11	31	17	32	3	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	14	21	0	36	0	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	0	0	25	25	0
UniWestern-I (94)	7	34	10	40	0	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	21	36	7	36	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	56	19	19	0	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 15 (continued)

Here are some ideas about higher education in the context of change. Check the category that best indicates your personal view on each of these matters.

(12) Radical technological changes in our society necessitate radical changes in the educational experiences offered our youth, not because the past was bad, but because the future will be different.

1.....Strongly agree
2.....Agree
3.....Can't say
4.....Disagree
5.....Strongly disagree

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	19***	40	11	20	3	1
South (22)	46	41	4	9	0	0
Southeast (15)	47	27	20	7	0	0
North (35)	20	37	11	20	6	3
Midwest (33)	15	52	12	18	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	16	37	8	22	0	4
UniEastern-B (25)	12	48	24	8	4	0
East-C (42)	12	48	7	21	7	0
East-D (5)	0	60	20	20	0	0
West-E (38)	16	34	16	21	5	3
West-F (18)	39	17	0	22	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	17	43	8	20	5	1
UniWestern-J$_1$ (14)	14	21	36	21	0	7
UniWestern-J$_2$ (4)	0	100	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	16	33	11	29	3	1
UniWestern-H$_1$ (14)	14	43	36	7	0	0
UniWestern-H$_2$ (16)	31	38	6	19	0	0

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 16

Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how would you describe yourself in the area of religion?

(13) 1.....Deeply religious
2.....Moderately religious
3.....Largely indifferent to religion
4.....Basically opposed to religion
5.....Prefer not to answer

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	14***	33	28	11	4	7
South (22)	27	36	9	0	9	14
Southeast (15)	27	53	13	0	7	0
North (35)	6	54	20	0	6	6
Midwest (33)	36	42	6	6	3	6
UniEastern-A (51)	8	26	37	16	2	10
UniEastern-B (25)	16	20	32	16	12	4
East-C (42)	7	33	31	14	2	12
East-D (5)	20	0	60	20	0	0
West-E (38)	21	40	29	5	3	3
West-F (18)	22	17	28	17	0	11
UniWestern-G (151)	14	32	37	10	1	5
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	29	14	43	7	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	0	75	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	11	36	24	14	4	8
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	21	14	21	36	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	12	12	38	19	0	12

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 17

(Note: The respondents were given four lengthy descriptive statements on existing student subcultures at American colleges and univerisites. These statements can be found in the complete questionnaire in Appendix A. Respondents were then asked to answer the following questions by ranking each group 1-2-3. First choices only are listed here.)

(15-18) Which group(s) would you like to see increased in size and influence on your campus?

15.....Professionalists
16.....Collegiates
17.....Intellectuals
18.....Disaffiliates

Institution (N*)	15	16	17	18
CIT (577)	5**	2	39	6
South (22)	4	0	23	9
Southeast (15)	13	7	40	7
North (35)	6	0	37	3
Midwest (33)	0	6	61	0
UniEastern-A (51)	0	0	37	10
UniEastern-B (25)	4	8	16	4
East-C (42)	2	2	33	5
East-D (5)	0	0	60	0
West-E (38)	3	0	53	3
West-F (18)	11	0	56	11
UniWestern-G (151)	11	5	34	3
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	0	43	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	0	75	0
UniWestern-I (94)	3	1	37	11
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	0	43	21
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	0	44	0

*N = Number of respondents.
**Responses shown in percentage.

Question 17 (continued)

(Note: The respondents were given four lengthy descriptive statements on existing student subcultures at American colleges and universities. These statements can be found in the complete questionnaire in Appendix A. Respondents were then asked to answer the following questions by ranking each group 1-2-3. First choices only are listed here.)

(19-22) Which group(s) do you find the most unrewarding to teach?

19.....Professionalists
20.....Collegiates
21.....Intellectuals
22.....Disaffiliates

Institution (N*)	19	20	21	22
CIT (577)	11**	23	3	13
South (22)	9	23	0	4
Southeast (15)	20	13	0	33
North (35)	6	17	3	11
Midwest (33)	12	36	3	6
UniEastern-A (51)	2	29	4	10
UniEastern-B (25)	8	12	0	12
East-C (42)	19	19	0	5
East-D (5)	40	20	0	0
West-E (38)	5	32	5	16
West-F (18)	28	22	0	17
UniWestern-G (151)	10	15	5	21
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	14	29	0	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	50	0	25
UniWestern-I (94)	10	30	1	8
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	29	29	7	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	19	25	0	0

*N = Number of respondents.
**Responses shown in percentage.

Question 17 (continued)

(Note: The respondents were given four lengthy descriptive statements on existing student subcultures at American colleges and universities. These statements can be found in the complete questionnaire in Appendix A. Respondents were then asked to answer the following questions by ranking each group 1-2-3. First choices only are listed here.)

(23-26) Which group(s) is presently dominant in influence on campus?

23.....Professionalists
24.....Collegiates
25.....Intellectuals
26.....Disaffiliates

Institution (N*)	23	24	25	26
CIT (577)	17**	23	7	1
South (22)	4	4	23	4
Southeast (15)	7	60	0	0
North (35)	20	9	6	0
Midwest (33)	24	24	12	0
UniEastern-A (51)	18	28	0	2
UniEastern-B (25)	20	4	4	4
East-C (42)	17	26	0	0
East-D (5)	20	40	0	0
West-E (38)	16	40	0	0
West-F (18)	0	0	56	11
UniWestern-G (151)	24	21	3	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	21	7	21	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	0	25	0
UniWestern-I (94)	8	32	2	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	7	21	21	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	12	12	6

*N = Number of respondents.
**Responses shown in percentage.

Question 18

Who would you say has the most powerful voice in determining the educational policies, i.e., the general objectives rather than the particulars of a given program, in your college? (Note: Respondents were then asked to rank the options 1-2-3, but first choice only is given here.)

(28)/0.....Trustees or Regents
1.....Chief Administration Officer of your campus (President, Chancellor)
2.....Chief Administration Officer of your program (Dean, Provost)
3.....Division Head
4.....An Executive Committee. Please specify:
5.....The general faculty
6.....Students
7.....Constituency
8.....State-wide coordinating agency
9.....Others. Please specify:

Institution (N*)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	NR**
CIT (577)	5***	20	18	1	6	33	0	1	1	2	12
South (22)	0	4	68	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	9
Southeast (15)	20	33	7	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	13
North (35)	14	9	49	0	6	11	0	0	0	0	11
Midwest (33)	3	27	3	0	6	42	0	0	0	3	15
UniEastern-A (51)	2	20	24	2	2	26	0	2	4	2	18
UniEastern-B (25)	0	20	8	0	20	36	0	0	0	4	12
East-C (42)	12	38	17	2	10	17	0	0	0	0	5
East-D (5)	0	20	40	0	0	20	0	0	0	20	0
West-E (38)	3	55	16	3	5	13	0	0	0	3	3
West-F (18)	0	6	39	0	6	44	0	0	0	0	6
UniWestern-G (151)	4	12	15	0	6	46	0	1	2	3	11
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	0	7	0	21	57	0	7	0	0	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	0	0	0	25	75	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	5	21	6	2	1	42	1	0	3	1	17
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	14	21	14	0	0	36	0	0	0	7	7
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	6	31	19	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	31

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 19

Please scale your faculty colleagues, as personal observation allows, on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of your college by checking one response for each item.

(31) Seem to favor "change for change's sake"

1.....Most
2.....About half
3.....Some
4.....Very few

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	NR**
CIT (577)	2***	6	33	55	3
South (22)	0	9	50	32	9
Southeast (15)	7	7	33	47	7
North (35)	0	9	54	34	3
Midwest (33)	6	3	39	52	0
UniEastern-A (51)	0	2	26	71	2
UniEastern-B (25)	4	16	12	60	4
East-C (42)	0	2	33	62	0
East-D (5)	0	20	0	80	0
West-E (38)	5	0	40	55	0
West-F (18)	6	11	33	50	0
UniWestern-G (151)	2	4	27	62	5
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	14	43	43	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	25	50	25	0
UniWestern-I (94)	1	6	33	53	3
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	14	43	43	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	12	31	38	19

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 19 (continued)

Please scale your faculty colleagues, as personal observation allows, on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of your college by checking one response for each item.

(32) Willing to participate personally in experimental educational ventures

1.....Most
2.....About half
3.....Some
4.....Very few

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	NR**
CIT (577)	20***	23	43	9	3
South (22)	50	41	4	0	4
Southeast (15)	0	40	40	13	7
North (35)	9	37	43	6	3
Midwest (33)	39	33	27	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	8	20	59	10	2
UniEastern-B (25)	20	8	52	16	0
East-C (42)	14	29	48	10	0
East-D (5)	80	0	0	20	0
West-E (38)	10	29	53	8	0
West-F (18)	83	6	11	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	17	24	42	11	4
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	36	21	36	7	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	25	50	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	4	13	62	14	3
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	71	21	7	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	50	19	19	0	12

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 19 (continued)

Please scale your faculty colleagues, as personal observation allows, on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of your college by checking one response for each item.

(33) Not hostile to innovation, but unwilling to get involved personally

1.....Most
2.....About half
3.....Some
4.....Very few

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	NR**
CIT (577)	18***	30	35	11	4
South (22)	14	23	27	27	9
Southeast (15)	13	27	47	7	7
North (35)	11	31	49	6	3
Midwest (33)	6	24	54	15	0
UniEastern-A (51)	20	33	35	6	4
UniEastern-B (25)	20	44	24	4	0
East-C (42)	21	36	40	2	0
East-D (5)	20	20	0	60	0
West-E (38)	21	37	32	10	0
West-F (18)	11	11	28	50	0
UniWestern-G (151)	20	28	36	9	6
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	14	21	43	14	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	25	0	25	0
UniWestern-I (94)	29	39	20	5	3
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	29	43	29	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	6	50	25	19

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 19 (continued)

Please scale your faculty colleagues, as personal observation allows, on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of your college by checking one response for each item.

(34) Hold to the principle that "nothing new must be tried for the first time"

1.....Most
2.....About half
3.....Some
4.....Very few

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	NR**
CIT (577)	2***	8	17	65	6
South (22)	4	4	0	68	9
Southeast (15)	7	7	33	47	7
North (35)	3	3	17	71	3
Midwest (33)	0	0	18	79	0
UniEastern-A (51)	2	8	24	59	8
UniEastern-B (25)	4	20	12	56	0
East-C (42)	0	2	21	74	2
East-D (5)	0	0	20	80	0
West-E (38)	3	13	29	50	5
West-F (18)	0	0	6	94	0
UniWestern-G (151)	1	9	14	66	6
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	14	7	64	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	0	25	75	0
UniWestern-I (94)	1	12	18	57	6
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	0	14	71	14
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	0	0	81	19

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 19 (continued)

Please scale your faculty colleagues, as personal observation allows, on their attitude toward innovation and experimentation in the curriculum of your college by checking one response for each item.

(35) Believe that "if it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change"

1.....Most
2.....About half
3.....Some
4.....Very few

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	NR**
CIT (577)	7***	10	24	49	7
South (22)	4	4	14	59	9
Southeast (15)	13	13	20	47	7
North (35)	9	11	29	46	6
Midwest (33)	6	6	33	46	9
UniEastern-A (51)	10	18	26	37	8
UniEastern-B (25)	16	28	36	16	0
East-C (42)	2	17	26	52	2
East-D (5)	0	0	20	80	0
West-E (38)	13	10	16	53	3
West-F (18)	0	6	17	78	0
UniWestern-G (151)	7	11	24	47	8
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	7	7	79	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	0	25	75	0
UniWestern-I (94)	6	6	26	46	8
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	0	29	71	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	0	6	69	25

---

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 21

Have you published?

(37) Articles
0.....None [Combined with NR]
1.....One
2.....Two-three
3.....Four-six
4.....Seven-ten
5.....Eleven-fifteen
6.....More

Institution (N*)	0-NR**	1	2	3	4	5	6
CIT (577)	14***	8	16	12	10	8	31
South (22)	32	14	14	14	9	0	18
Southeast (15)	13	7	33	7	20	0	13
North (35)	17	3	26	9	9	11	26
Midwest (33)	30	9	46	9	3	0	3
UniEastern-A (51)	22	4	12	22	12	12	16
UniEastern-B (25)	16	4	20	12	16	20	12
East-C (42)	26	19	17	10	7	7	14
East-D (5)	0	20	40	20	20	0	0
West-E (38)	18	13	29	24	3	3	8
West-F (18)	33	17	11	17	17	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	2	5	7	11	10	6	57
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	0	7	7	14	7	64
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	25	0	0	0	25	50
UniWestern-I (94)	8	4	13	8	12	12	43
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	21	21	7	14	7	14	14
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	19	0	19	19	19	6	19

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 21 (Continued)

Have you published?

(38) Monographs
0.....None [Combined with NR]
1.....One
2.....Two-three
3.....Four-six
4.....Seven-ten
5.....Eleven-fifteen
6.....More

Institution (N*)	0-NR**	1	2	3	4	5	6
CIT (577)	74***	10	10	3	1	0	1
South (22)	59	18	9	4	0	4	0
Southeast (15)	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
North (35)	74	14	9	3	0	0	0
Midwest (33)	85	12	3	0	0	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	74	14	10	2	0	0	0
UniEastern-B (25)	80	4	8	4	0	0	0
East-C (42)	79	7	7	2	2	0	0
East-D (5)	80	0	0	0	0	0	0
West-E (38)	79	13	5	0	0	0	0
West-F (18)	78	6	11	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	72	11	9	4	2	1	2
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	57	21	14	0	0	0	7
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	0	25	25	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	70	8	13	4	0	0	3
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	71	0	29	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	62	19	19	0	0	0	0

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 21 (Continued)

Have you published?

(39) Books
0.....None [Combined with NR]
1.....One
2.....Two-three
3.....Four-six
4.....Seven-ten
5.....Eleven-fifteen
6.....More

Institution (N*)	0-NR**	1	2	3	4	5	6
CIT (577)	62***	20	12	4	1	0	0
South (22)	64	18	9	9	0	0	0
Southeast (15)	93	0	0	7	0	0	0
North (35)	46	29	14	11	0	0	0
Midwest (33)	76	15	0	6	0	3	0
UniEastern-A (51)	63	22	10	4	0	0	0
UniEastern-B (25)	40	36	16	8	0	0	0
East-C (42)	67	19	10	2	2	0	0
East-D (5)	80	0	20	0	0	0	0
West-E (38)	66	16	13	0	0	3	3
West-F (18)	94	0	6	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	67	19	11	1	0	1	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	57	21	21	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	75	0	25	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	46	30	14	5	4	0	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	71	0	29	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	62	25	12	0	0	0	0

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 22

List your discipline or specialization.

[40)/1.....Humanities, Fine Arts, Architecture
2.....Social Sciences
3.....Natural Sciences
4.....Education
5.....Engineering
6.....Agriculture, Forestry
7.....Business Administration]

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NR**
CIT (577)	35***	20	28	4	3	4	0	4
South (22)	50	23	23	0	0	0	0	4
Southeast (15)	33	0	40	20	0	0	0	7
North (35)	40	20	26	6	0	0	3	3
Midwest (33)	52	18	15	12	0	0	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	41	26	28	0	0	0	0	4
UniEastern-B (25)	44	32	12	8	0	0	0	4
East-C (42)	43	29	17	0	5	0	0	2
East-D (5)	40	0	60	0	0	0	0	0
West-E (38)	45	5	34	8	0	0	3	5
West-F (18)	50	28	22	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	17	13	40	2	7	17	0	3
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	21	7	71	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	50	25	0	0	0	0	25
UniWestern-I (94)	42	20	20	8	4	0	0	4
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	14	64	14	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	31	44	12	0	0	0	0	12

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 23

Highest degree held (check):

(50)/1.....B.A. [B.S.]
2.....M.A.[M.S., M.F.A., M.E.]
3.....Ph.D.
4.....Ed.D.
5.....Other [Other Ph.D., e.g., LL.D., D.V.M., honorary]

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	1***	13	77	3	3	2
South (22)	0	27	64	0	0	4
Southeast (15)	0	43	36	14	7	0
North (35)	0	9	80	3	6	3
Midwest (33)	0	33	61	3	0	0
UniEastern-A (51)	2	12	80	0	2	2
UniEastern-B (25)	8	0	80	4	4	4
East-C (42)	2	21	67	7	0	2
East-D (5)	0	0	80	0	20	0
West-E (38)	0	22	76	0	3	0
West-F (18)	0	22	78	0	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	1	9	82	1	4	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	0	100	0	0	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	0	100	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	0	4	83	8	2	2
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	21	79	0	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	6	81	0	0	12

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 24

Institution conferring highest degree:

[(55)/1.....State
2.....Independent
3.....Protestant
4.....Catholic
5.....Foreign]

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	44***	40	1	1	4	13
South (22)	50	32	4	4	0	9
Southeast (15)	40	40	0	0	0	20
North (35)	51	31	3	3	3	9
Midwest (33)	67	18	3	0	9	12
UniEastern-A (51)	35	53	0	0	6	12
UniEastern-B (25)	16	64	4	4	0	8
East-C (42)	7	71	2	2	5	17
East-D (5)	20	60	0	0	0	20
West-E (38)	45	40	5	0	3	10
West-F (18)	28	56	0	0	11	17
UniWestern-G (151)	60	28	0	0	3	13
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	21	64	0	0	14	14
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	50	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	49	37	0	0	2	14
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	25	44	0	0	0	31
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	27	60	0	0	6	13

* N = Number or respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 25

Present rank (check):

(59)/1.....Instructor
2.....Assistant Professor
3.....Associate Professor
4.....Professor
5.....Other (Specify)

Institution (N*)	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	3***	31	24	37	4	2
South (22)	4	18	27	41	0	9
Southeast (15)	13	27	13	47	0	0
North (35)	3	20	23	46	6	3
Midwest (33)	3	39	27	18	12	0
UniEastern-A (51)	6	31	29	24	6	4
UniEastern-B (25)	12	24	16	40	4	4
East-C (42)	10	36	24	24	0	7
East-D (5)	0	40	0	20	40	0
West-E (38)	0	29	29	42	0	0
West-F (18)	6	33	44	17	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	0	31	19	46	2	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	0	29	7	64	0	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	25	0	75	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	0	31	30	37	1	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	86	7	7	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	25	44	19	0	12

* N = Number of respondents.
** NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
*** Responses shown in percentage.

Question 26

Years of full-time teaching, prior to current year, at the college level, but without regard to institutions:

(60)/0..... 0 yrs.
1..... 1- 3 yrs.
2..... 4- 6 yrs.
3..... 7-10 yrs.
4.....11-14 yrs.
5.....15-18 yrs.
6.....19-21 yrs.
7.....22-25 yrs.
8.....More than 25 yrs. (Specify)

Institution (N*)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR**
CIT (577)	4***	21	16	15	12	11	5	5	8	2
South (22)	9	9	14	18	18	0	14	4	4	9
Southeast (15)	0	13	20	20	7	13	0	0	27	0
North (35)	3	6	11	17	9	11	9	17	14	3
Midwest (33)	6	15	18	24	9	3	3	6	15	0
UniEastern-A (51)	4	31	22	12	10	12	2	0	4	4
UniEastern-B (25)	4	16	12	12	12	20	8	8	4	4
East-C (42)	0	12	17	14	26	14	12	2	0	2
East-D (5)	0	40	0	20	0	0	20	20	0	0
West-E (38)	0	26	13	24	10	10	3	5	5	3
West-F (18)	0	22	33	28	6	6	6	0	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	4	25	10	12	15	12	5	5	11	2
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	7	14	29	7	14	0	0	7	21	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	0	50	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	4	16	18	16	7	16	5	6	10	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	0	50	36	7	7	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	19	25	12	12	19	0	0	0	0	12

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant response not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 27

Years of full-time teaching at this institution, not counting the current year:

(61)/0..... 0 yrs.
1..... 1- 3 yrs.
2..... 4- 6 yrs.
3..... 7-10 yrs.
4.....11-14 yrs.
5.....15-18 yrs.
6.....19-21 yrs.
7.....22-25 yrs.
8.....More than 25 yrs.(Specify)

Institution (N*)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	NR**
CIT (577)	9***	36	16	11	6	9	4	2	5	2
South (22)	18	46	23	4	0	0	0	0	0	9
Southeast (15)	0	27	20	7	0	13	0	7	27	0
North (35)	11	31	11	11	3	3	11	6	6	6
Midwest (33)	6	33	21	15	0	3	3	6	9	3
UniEastern-A (51)	16	37	18	10	6	6	0	0	4	4
UniEastern-B (25)	0	40	24	8	4	12	4	4	0	4
East-C (42)	0	19	21	21	17	14	5	0	0	2
East-D (5)	40	40	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West-E (38)	0	37	26	16	5	8	3	0	3	3
West-F (18)	0	67	28	0	6	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-G (151)	8	35	8	11	9	13	8	1	7	1
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	7	36	36	7	0	0	0	0	14	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	25	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-I (94)	8	34	15	11	6	13	5	3	3	1
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	7	86	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	69	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

Question 28

What is your undergraduate teaching load during the current term?

(62)/0.....0 hours
1.....1-5 hours
2.....6-8 hours
3.....9-11 hours
4.....12-15 hours
5.....16 hours or more

Institution (N*)	0	1	2	3	4	5	NR**
CIT (577)	15***	25	24	15	17	2	3
South (22)	0	4	23	46	14	4	9
Southeast (15)	0	7	7	29	50	7	0
North (35)	6	6	20	23	40	0	6
Midwest (33)	3	3	24	27	39	0	3
UniEastern-A (51)	4	24	41	22	4	0	6
UniEastern-B (25)	12	4	32	20	24	4	4
East-C (42)	5	5	14	12	60	2	2
East-D (5)	20	0	40	0	20	20	0
West-E (38)	3	5	18	37	34	3	0
West-F (18)	0	11	6	33	39	11	0
UniWestern-G (151)	26	41	26	3	1	1	2
UniWestern-J_1 (14)	64	36	0	0	0	0	0
UniWestern-J_2 (4)	50	0	25	0	0	0	25
UniWestern-I (94)	22	36	30	5	4	0	2
UniWestern-H_1 (14)	14	64	7	14	0	0	0
UniWestern-H_2 (16)	0	50	38	0	0	0	12

*N = Number of respondents.
**NR = No response. Variant responses not given due to their small number.
***Responses shown in percentage.

APPENDIX C

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

150667

....(73-78)
R & D – 1 (General)

Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is intended to provide information about college students (i.e., their background, attitudes, etc.) for the Center. The information in this questionnaire will be kept confidential; under no circumstances will it be made available to the college on an individual basis.

The questionnaire includes some items that relate to family, religion, sex, politics, etc. Although you are not required to do so, we hope that you will be able to respond to all items.

Name (Print):..
(Last) (First) (Initial)

Sex: .... Male
(79)
.... Female

College:..
(Full name of college attending)

College Address:..

....

....

Please list a permanent address through which we might reach you for additional information three to five years from now. Give us the full name of the person whose address it is if it is not listed in your name.

....

....

....

c/o..

C-1

1. What is the highest level of education that you expect to attain during your lifetime?

*(1) 1 ______ Two or three years of college
2 ______ Vocational or technical degree not demanding four years of college
3 ______ Bachelor's degree
4 ______ Teaching credential
5 ______ Master's degree
6 ______ Ph.D. or D.Sc.
7 ______ Professional degree [LL.B. (law), M.D. (medicine), D.D.S. (dentistry), etc.]
8 ______ I have no idea.

2. Which of the following objectives do you hope to gain in college? Place a . . .

"1" next to the *most* important objective
"2" next to the *second* most important

(2-3) 1 ______ To master certain techniques applicable to my vocation or field of special interest
2 ______ To acquire and use the skills and habits involved in critical and constructive thinking
3 ______ To attain a satisfactory emotional and social adjustment
4 ______ To develop a broad general outlook and familiarity with a variety of subjects
5 ______ To acquire knowledge and attitudes basic to a satisfying family life

3. a) Have you decided upon a major?

1 ______ Yes
2 ______ No

b) *If yes,* what is it? ______________________

(4-5) ______________________

c) *If yes,* when did you decide on your college major?

(6) 1 ______ 6th grade or earlier
2 ______ 7th through 9th grade
3 ______ 10th through 12th grade. If your decision was made during your senior year in high school,

please check: ______________
4 ______ After high school but before college

d) *If yes,* how definite is your choice?

(7) 1 ______ Very definite
2 ______ Fairly definite, but still considering other possibilities
3 ______ Very tentative

e) If you have a major, what were the *main* reasons for your choice of this major?

Check those that apply

(8) ______ Long-term interest
(9) ______ Made good grades in this subject during high school
(10) ______ It appeared to have the least overall pressure (difficulty or amount of work; competition)
(11) ______ Parents' wish or advice
(12) ______ High school faculty encouraged me
(13) ______ Prestige of occupation toward which it leads
(14) ______ Leads to work with people
(15) ______ Freedom of course selection in that department
(16) ______ I had friends majoring in it who influenced me
(17) ______ Quality of faculty or their approach

(Please comment) ______________
(18) ______ Opportunity for significant accomplishment in the area
(Please comment) ______________

(19) ______ Other; Specify: ______________

---

*Please ignore numbers in parentheses; they are for data processing purposes.

4. a) Have you decided, even tentatively, what occupation or vocation you want to enter after college?

1 ______ Yes
2 ______ No

b) *If yes,* what is it? ______________________

(20-21) ______________________

c) *If yes,* when did you arrive at your choice of an occupation?

(22) 1 ______ 6th grade or earlier
2 ______ 7th through 9th grade
3 ______ 10th through 12th grade. If your decision was made during your senior year in high school,

please check: ______________
4 ______ After high school but before college

d) *If yes,* how definite is your choice of an occupation?

(23) 1 ______ Very definite
2 ______ Fairly definite, but still considering other choices
3 ______ Very tentative

e) If you have an occupation in mind, what are the main reasons for your choice of this occupation. Please specify:

(24-30) ______________________
____

5. When do you expect to be married?

(31) 1 ______ Before graduation from college
2 ______ Right after graduation
3 ______ After graduate or professional school
4 ______ After a period of employment
5 ______ Do not expect to marry
6 ______ Don't know

FOR WOMEN ONLY — Question 6

6. For what length of time do you expect to be employed?

(32) 1 ______ For a brief period before marriage
2 ______ For brief intervals throughout my life
3 ______ Part time for the major part of my life
4 ______ Full time for the major part of my life
5 ______ Do not expect to be employed
6 ______ Don't know

7. Do you prefer classroom assignments which are definite or ones where things are left largely or completely up to your own initiative?

(33) 1 ______ Prefer definite assignments
2 ______ Prefer assignments where topics and approach, etc., are left up to me

8. How many papers have you had to write in high school?

(34) 1 ______ A great many
2 ______ A moderate number
3 ______ Relatively few or none

9. How do you feel about writing papers?

(35) 1 ______ I very much dislike it and prefer to avoid it.
2 ______ I dislike it somewhat.
3 ______ I have neutral feelings about this.
4 ______ I like it somewhat.
5 ______ I like it very much.

10. a) Please indicate the extent of your participation in each of the following activities. For each activity, check ALL columns which are appropriate. If you have not participated or performed in an activity, put a check in the first column.

Activity	Have never performed or participated	At what periods have you participated in this activity?		Have you participated as part of a school, church, or other sponsored formal activity, including formal instruction?	Have you engaged in this activity, informally, on your own, for your own pleasure?	
		Before High School	During High School		Occasionally	Often
	0	1	2	1	2	3
Acting (plays)	(36)___	___	___	(37)___	___	___
Debating	(38)___	___	___	(39)___	___	___
Modern dance, Ballet, etc.	(40)___	___	___	(41)___	___	___
Music (composition)	(42)___	___	___	(43)___	___	___
Music (performance)	(44)___	___	___	(45)___	___	___
Painting, Sketching	(46)___	___	___	(47)___	___	___
Photography	(48)___	___	___	(49)___	___	___
Scientific paper	(50)___	___	___	(51)___	___	___
Scientific research	(52)___	___	___	(53)___	___	___
Sculpture	(54)___	___	___	(55)___	___	___
Writing plays	(56)___	___	___	(57)___	___	___
Writing poetry	(58)___	___	___	(59)___	___	___
Writing stories	(60)___	___	___	(61)___	___	___
Other creative activity. Specify:						
______________	(62)___	___	___	(63)___	___	___
______________	(64)___	___	___	(65)___	___	___
______________	(66)___	___	___	(67)___	___	___

(68-72)
(73-79)
(80) 1
(1-11)

b) Please list awards you have won for the types of activities listed above. Indicate the nature of the award, the size and nature of the contest. For example, first place in all-school essay contest; third place in regional art contest.

____
____
____

11. About how many books did your family own when you were in high school?

(12) 1 ______ 50 or fewer
2 ______ 51 - 100
3 ______ 101 - 200
4 ______ 201 - 500
5 ______ 501 - 1,000
6 ______ Over 1,000

12. How many books do you yourself own, including paperbacks?

(13) 1 ______ None
2 ______ 1 - 10
3 ______ 11 - 25
4 ______ 26 - 50
5 ______ 51 - 100
6 ______ 101 - 200
7 ______ Over 200

13. During the past year have you read any books for your own pleasure that were not required in class? If so, how many?

(14) 1 ______ None
2 ______ One
3 ______ Two
4 ______ 3 - 4
5 ______ 5 - 10
6 ______ 10 - 15
7 ______ 15 - 25
8 ______ Over 25

14. What types of magazines may be found frequently in your home?

(15) ______ Business (Business Week, Consumer's Report, Forbes, Fortune, Wall Street Journal, etc.)
(16) ______ Commentary, Literary and Political (Atlantic Monthly, Commentary, Harper's, National Review, New Republic, New York Times, New York Times Book Review, New Yorker, Saturday Review, The Nation, etc.)
(17) ______ Cultural and Scientific (American Art, American Heritage, Horizon, National Geographic, Scientific American, Theatre Arts, etc.)
(18) ______ Detective, Movie, Romance, Science Fiction
(19) ______ Hobby and Sports (Aviation, Boating, Downbeat, Flying, Hi-Fi, Hot Rod, Outdoor Life, Photography, Popular Electronics, Popular Mechanics, Sports Illustrated, Strength and Health, etc.)
(20) ______ Humor (Mad, etc.)
(21) ______ News and World Affairs (Newsweek, Time, etc.)
(22) ______ Occupational and Professional (academic, educational, engineering, farm, legal, medical, psychological-psychiatric, sociological, trade, etc., journals)
(23) ______ Popular Fashion, Homemaking, Pictorial, and Digests (Charm, Seventeen, Vogue; Esquire, Playboy; Better Homes and Gardens, Cosmopolitan, Good Housekeeping, McCall's, Saturday Evening Post; Ebony, Life, Look; Reader's Digest, etc.)
(24) ______ Religious (America, Ave Maria, Christian Herald, Conquest, Family Digest, Presbyterian Life, Quaker Life, Watchtower, etc.)
(25) ______ Travel (Holiday, Venture, etc.)
(26) ______ Other; Specify: ______________________________
____

15. If there are any magazines you have been reading regularly over the past year, what are they?

(27-38)______________________________
____

Which one of these magazines is your favorite?

(39) ______________________________

16. Before coming to college how often did you attend professional plays, concerts or dance productions?

	None	Occasionally	Frequently
	1	2	3
(40) a) Before high school	______	______	______
(41-42) b) During high school	______	______	______

17. Have you ever traveled or lived outside North America?

(43) 1 ______ Yes (If you have lived or traveled outside North America for 6 months or more, please check: ______________________)
2 ______ No

18. How important is each of the following areas for your parents, and how important do you expect each to be for you? In this case, "important" means there is interest and concern, regardless of actual time devoted to it. Rate how important each of the following is from 1 to 3:

1 = Important
2 = Somewhat important
3 = Not important

	Self	Father	Mother
Artistic, cultural interests	(44)______	(45)______	(46)______
Community activities	(47)______	(48)______	(49)______
Family affairs	(50)______	(51)______	(52)______
Financial interests	(53)______	(54)______	(55)______
Humanitarian ideals	(56)______	(57)______	(58)______
Intellectual interests	(59)______	(60)______	(61)______
Politics	(62)______	(63)______	(64)______
Recreation, hobbies	(65)______	(66)______	(67)______
Religion	(68)______	(69)______	(70)______
Sports, athletics (73-79) (80) 2	(1)______	(2)______	(3)______
Vocational pursuits	(4)______	(5)______	(6)______

19. What were the chief interests of your closest friends in high school? If more than one, please rank the two or three most descriptive phrases by placing a . . .

"1" next to the *most* descriptive phrase
"2" next to the *second most* descriptive phrase
"3" next to the *third most* descriptive phrase

(7-9)
1 ______ Activities (school activities)
2 ______ Academic (school work)
3 ______ Artistic (dance, drama, music, painting, sculpting)
4 ______ Athletics or sports
5 ______ Bohemian or non-conforming
6 ______ Car addicts
7 ______ Clothes addicts
8 ______ Church
9 ______ Out-of-doors (camping, hiking, Explorer Scouts, etc.)
10 ______ Political (political parties, demonstrations)
11 ______ Social (dances, parties)
12 ______ None of the above. Specify other: ______________

____

20. About how much interest would you say you have in national and world affairs?

(10) 1 ______ A great deal
2 ______ A moderate amount
3 ______ Only a little
4 ______ None at all

21. Please rate the opinions held on the issues below by yourself, your father, and your mother. Rate each issue from 1 to 5:

1 = In favor
2 = In favor with reservations
3 = Neutral or no opinion
4 = Against with reservations
5 = Against

ISSUES	Self	Father	Mother
a) Expansion of the war in Vietnam	(11)___	(12)___	(13)___
b) Financial aid to underprivileged minority groups	(14)___	(15)___	(16)___
c) General welfare programs such as social security and medicare	(17)___	(18)	___(19)___
d) Supreme Court decisions upholding civil rights	(20)___	(21)___	(22)___
e) House Un-American Activities Committee	(23)___	(24)___	(25)___

22. Which of the following would describe your feelings if a person of *any* race different from yours were to be your roommate at college?

(26) 1 ______ Welcoming
2 ______ Accepting
3 ______ No reaction; neutral
4 ______ Disapproving
5 ______ Strongly opposing

23. How do *your opinions* on issues of race relations compare with those of your parents?

(27) 1 ______ Mine are more liberal than parents.
2 ______ About the same as parents
3 ______ More conservative than parents
4 ______ More liberal than my father, more conservative than my mother
5 ______ More liberal than my mother, more conservative than my father
6 ______ Other; Specify: ______________

____

24. Apart from any formal religious affiliation, how do you think of yourself?

(28) 1 ______ I am deeply religious.
2 ______ I am moderately religious.
3 ______ I am largely indifferent to religion.
4 ______ I am basically opposed to religion.
5 ______ I have no opinion.

25. How does your religious faith compare with that of your parents?

(29) 1 ______ I am more religious than they are.
2 ______ About the same as parents
3 ______ Less religious than they are
4 ______ More religious than my father, less religious than my mother
5 ______ More religious than my mother, less religious than my father
6 ______ Other; Specify: ______________

____

26. Which of the following statements most closely describes your personal religious, philosophical or ethical convictions?
Check one

(30) 1 ______ I have strong religious beliefs and convictions to which I adhere without hesitation.
2 ______ I have a well-organized philosophy of life which guides most of my thinking and behavior.
3 ______ I have a general philosophy of life by which I try to live.
4 ______ Although troubled at times by doubts, I have a set of personal beliefs which I can apply to most situations.
5 ______ My personal beliefs are hazy, changing, and of uncertain importance in my life.
6 ______ I deal with situations as they arise and my values are determined accordingly.
7 ______ I do not think it necessary to have well-organized personal beliefs, and I prefer to avoid abstract speculations.

27. Which of the following phrases are most descriptive of you during the period you attended high school? If two or three phrases are descriptive, place a . . .

"1" next to the *most* descriptive phrase
"2" next to the *second most* descriptive phrase
"3" next to the *third most* descriptive phrase

(31-33) 1 ______ In conflict and rebellion against my parents
2 ______ Opposed to almost all authority
3 ______ Introspective
4 ______ Critical and reevaluative of accepted values and modes of thinking
5 ______ Out for a good time
6 ______ Relatively happy and content
7 ______ Concerned about social acceptance from others my own age
8 ______ Unhappy and alienated from most of those around me
9 ______ Independent in my thoughts and actions

28. Some people are very involved in examining the motivations for their behavior. How important do you feel this kind of self-analysis is for you?

(34) 1 ______ Of extreme importance to me
2 ______ Of some importance to me
3 ______ Of little importance for the most part

29. Are there moments when you get a great deal of satisfaction and enjoyment from being alone?

(35) 1 ______ Frequently
2 ______ Sometimes
3 ______ Seldom

How do you feel about competing with other students for grades and recognition?

(36) 1 ______ I very much dislike it and prefer to avoid it.
2 ______ I dislike it somewhat.
3 ______ I have neutral feelings about this.
4 ______ I like it somewhat.
5 ______ I like it very much.

1. The following two questionnaire items provide a list of scales made up of paired terms that are to be judged in relation to the meaning of two concepts. The two concepts are: YOURSELF AS YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE and YOURSELF AS YOU THINK YOU REALLY ARE. Place a mark on the scale *within a space* which best describes or rates the concept at the top of the sheet. Be sure to check every scale for each of the two concepts—*do not omit any* even though the pair of terms seems unrelated to the particular concept. Make each scale item a separate and independent judgment.

EXAMPLE:

MUSIC

Enjoyable ✓ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Unenjoyable
Civilized ___ : ___ : ___ : ✓ : ___ : ___ : ___ Primitive
Bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ✓ : ___ Good
Abstract ___ : ✓ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Concrete

In the above example, Music was rated as being very enjoyable, neither civilized nor primitive, slightly good, and quite abstract.

a) MYSELF AS I REALLY AM

(37) practical ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ impractical
(38) masculine ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ feminine
(39) clean ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ dirty
(40) shallow ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ deep
(41) strong ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ weak
(42) active ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ passive
(43) cold ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ hot
(44) bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ good
(45) beautiful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ ugly
(46) unstable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ stable
(47) safe ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ dangerous
(48) unpleasant ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ pleasant
(49) complex ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ simple
(50) kind ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ cruel
(51) light ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ heavy
(52) dull ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ sharp
(53) relaxed ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ tense
(54) hard ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ soft
(55) sick ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ healthy
(56) slow ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ fast

b) MYSELF AS I WOULD LIKE TO BE

(57) practical ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ impractical
(58) masculine ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ feminine
(59) clean ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ dirty
(60) shallow ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ deep
(61) strong ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ weak
(62) active ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ passive
(63) cold ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ hot
(64) bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ good
(65) beautiful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ ugly
(66) unstable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ stable
(67) safe ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ dangerous
(68) unpleasant ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ pleasant
(69) complex ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ simple
(70) kind ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ cruel
(71) light ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ heavy
(72) dull ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ sharp
(73-79)
(80) 3
(1) relaxed ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ tense
(2) hard ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ soft
(3) sick ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ healthy
(4) slow ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ fast

32. Have any of the following events occurred in your family during your lifetime? Check as many as apply. Please place a check in the first column if the event occurred before high school and in the second column if the event occurred during or after high school.

	Before High School 1	During or After High School 2
(5) Separation of parents	______	______
(6) Divorce of parents	______	______
(7) Serious prolonged physical illness of either parent	______	______
(8) Severe social adjustment problems	______	______
(9) Prolonged unemployment of father (6 months or more)	______	______
(10) Prolonged absence of father—employed elsewhere, in service, etc. (6 months or more)	______	______
(11) Death of a member of immediate household	______	______

33. How did your family feel about independent activity (that is, doing things individually or with others apart from the family)?

Check one

(12) 1 ______ Encouraged it
2 ______ Tolerated it
3 ______ Indifferent
4 ______ Discouraged it

34. Rate your home situation during the high school years on each of the following. *Circle* the most appropriate number on each of the scales.

		Very	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Very	
(13) In punishing you for broken rules or regulations, were your parents usually mild or severe in the penalties they gave?	Mild	1	2	3	4	5	Severe
(14) Did you generally have a vague or clear expectation of the kind of behavior expected of you by your parents?	Vague	1	2	3	4	5	Clear
(15) In general, would you say that your parents' attitude was an authoritarian, "laying down the law," *strict* kind of attitude or an easy-going, freedom-granting, *permissive* attitude?	Strict	1	2	3	4	5	Permissive

35. How do your parents react to your disagreements with them? *Check the one* which you think most closely approximates their reaction.

(16) 1 ______ They don't take my ideas very seriously.
2 ______ They feel I am mistaken in my opinions but think that I will get over them.
3 ______ They feel I am mistaken and seriously doubt whether I will ever "return to the fold."
4 ______ They take my ideas seriously and respect my differences as reasonable choices.
5 ______ My parents and I rarely or never disagree.

36. Can you generally discuss with your parents matters that are important to you?

(17) 1 ______ Yes, nearly everything
2 ______ Yes, some matters
3 ______ No
4 ______ Other; Comment: ______________________

____

37. How would you say your parents have generally reacted to your achievements?

	Father (18) *Check one*		Mother (19) *Check one*
In a belittling manner	______	1	______
Never satisfied	______	2	______
Indifferently	______	3	______
Appreciatively, but always with the expectation of still more achievement	______	4	______
Appreciatively	______	5	______
Always ready with praise	______	6	______

38. a) How close would you say you are to your father? To your mother?

	Father (20) *Check one*		Mother (21) *Check one*
Extremely close	______	1	______
Quite close	______	2	______
Somewhat close	______	3	______
Not very close	______	4	______

b) Basically, regardless of sex, which parent do you think you are more like?

(22) 1 ______ Father
2 ______ Mother
3 ______ Neither
4 ______ Don't know

c) Do you feel that in the last year or so you have been growing closer to your parents or further away from them than you used to be?

	Father (23) *Check one*		Mother (24) *Check one*
Closer	______	1	______
Further away	______	2	______
Not much change	______	3	______

39. What three persons or events influenced you most in your decision to enroll in this college? Place a . . .

"1" next to the *first most* important person or event,
"2" next to the *second most* important, and
"3" next to the *third most* important.

(25-27) 1 ______ Parent
2 ______ Other member of my family
3 ______ High school teacher
4 ______ High school counselor
5 ______ Friend attending the college
6 ______ Other person attending the college
7 ______ Staff member from the college
8 ______ Reading about the college in its catalogue
9 ______ Hearing or reading about the college in the mass media (Radio, T-V, Magazines, Newspapers, etc.)
10 ______ Visiting the college
11 ______ Other; Please specify: ______________________

____

40. a) Did anyone try to discourage you from attending this school?

(28) 1 ______ Yes
2 ______ No

b) *If yes,* what reasons were given?
Check as many as apply

(29) ______ Too much academic pressure
(30) ______ Academic standards not high enough
(31) ______ Too liberal politically
(32) ______ Too conservative politically
(33) ______ School not well enough known
(34) ______ School too small
(35) ______ Program not adequate in my field of interest
(36) ______ Not enough social life, sports, or other collegiate activities
(37) ______ Regulations too rigid
(38) ______ Rules too permissive
(39) ______ Unpleasant or inconvenient geographic location
(40) ______ Too expensive
(41) ______ Type of people attending
(42) ______ Other; Specify: ______________________

____

41. a) Did you have any hesitations (those listed above or any others) about attending this college?

(43) 1 ______ Yes
2 ______ No

b) *If yes,* please specify by writing in letter(s) from question above, or by writing out any other reason.

(44-57) ______________________________

____

42. When did you definitely make up your mind to go to college?

(58) 1 ______ It was always assumed that I would go.
2 ______ While in elementary school
3 ______ While in junior high school
4 ______ Early in high school
5 ______ During my junior year in high school
6 ______ During my senior year in high school
7 ______ After graduating from high school
8 ______ While I was in military service
9 ______ Don't remember

43. What colleges did you apply to or consider attending, in order of your preference? Please write the names of the colleges in full.

(59) a) First preference: ______________________

(60) b) Second preference: ______________________

(61-62) c) Third preference: ______________________

44. Do you see this college as having some special quality that distinguishes it from other colleges and universities?

(63) 1 ______ Not greatly different from other colleges
2 ______ It has a special distinguishing quality.

If yes, would you note briefly what you think this special quality is.

(64-72) ______________________________

____

____

(73-79)
(80) 4

5. How important was each of the following considerations to you *in selecting* the college you are now attending? *Check one* for each item.

	Important 1	Somewhat Important 2	Not Important or Not Applicable 3
(1) Career reasons; that is, important for getting a good job, getting into graduate or professional school	___	___	___
(2) Closely-knit college community, chance to know students and professors	___	___	___
(3) Extra-curricular activities	___	___	___
(4) Financial reasons, such as having a scholarship	___	___	___
(5) Friends attending this college	___	___	___
(6) General academic reputation of the college	___	___	___
(7) Geographic location, climate, etc.	___	___	___
(8) Influence or wishes of parents	___	___	___
(9) Opportunity for a great deal of freedom in my personal life	___	___	___
(10) Opportunity to live away from home	___	___	___
(11) Opportunity to participate in experimental educational programs	___	___	___
(12) Opportunity to pursue an individualized academic program	___	___	___
(13) Parent(s) attended the college	___	___	___
(14) Variety of elective courses	___	___	___
(15) A particular department	___	___	___

FOR STUDENTS ATTENDING A WOMEN'S COLLEGE: Please indicate how important each of the following considerations was in selecting this college.

(16) Courses geared to women's interests (more emphasis upon social problems, esthetics; special classes offered)	___	___	___
(17) More freedom of expression possible and more opportunity for developing individual potential without the presence of male students	___	___	___
(18) Less distraction and less emphasis upon male-female relationships	___	___	___

46. How much in each of the following areas *do you know* about the college you are attending? *Check one* for each item.

	Know a Lot About It 1	Know a Little About It 2	Don't Know Anything About It 3
(19) General philosophy of the college	___	___	___
(20) The kind of student attending	___	___	___
(21) What is really expected of a student as far as reading, written work, participation in discussion, and original thinking are concerned	___	___	___
(22) Variety and extent of course offerings	___	___	___
(23) The ratio of required work to free electives	___	___	___
(24) The availability of specialized, independent courses of study	___	___	___
(25) The academic reputation of the school	___	___	___
(26) The professional quality of the faculty	___	___	___
(27) The amount of individualized help from the faculty on academic matters	___	___	___
(28) The extent of informal student-faculty contact, opportunity to get to know the faculty personally, etc.	___	___	___
(29) The amount of competition to be expected in relation to the other students	___	___	___

47. If you were to choose an ideal college, which of the following features would you prefer to have? If neither of the paired choices is exactly what you would like, *check the one* that comes nearest.

	1		2	
(30) Mostly lecture classes	___	or	___	Mostly group discussion classes
(31) A predominantly residential campus	___	or	___	A campus where most students commute from home
(32) Small student body (around 1,000)	___	or	___	Large student body (around 10,000)
(33) Publicly supported college	___	or	___	Privately supported college
(34) Campus located in or near a city	___	or	___	Campus located in small town or in the country away from cities
(35) Has fraternities and sororities	___	or	___	Has no fraternities or sororities
(36) No graduate or professional schools	___	or	___	Has graduate and professional schools
(37) Intercollegiate athletics not emphasized	___	or	___	"Big time" intercollegiate athletics
(38) Students selected mostly on grades and admission scores	___	or	___	Students selected mostly on personal qualities
(39) Has high "snob" appeal	___	or	___	Has little "snob" appeal
(40) Courses graded "pass" or "fail"	___	or	___	Courses given letter grades (A, B, C, D, F)
(41) Students quite involved in off-campus politics	___	or	___	Students mainly concerned with campus activities
(42) Much emphasis on independent study	___	or	___	Little emphasis on independent study
(43) Church - affiliated college	___	or	___	Secular college
(44) Quarter system	___	or	___	Semester system
(45) College traditional in most respects	___	or	___	College experimental in most respects
(46) Co-educational	___	or	___	All one sex
(47) Much competitiveness for grades and recognition	___	or	___	Little competitiveness for grades and recognition
(48) Opportunity to live close to home	___	or	___	Opportunity to live away from home
(49) Closely - knit college community	___	or	___	Relatively impersonal college community
(50) Emphasis on a broad, general program of learning	___	or	___	Emphasis on a specialized area of learning
(51) Most students highly intelligent	___	or	___	Wide range of student intelligence
(52) College with a "party-school" reputation	___	or	___	College with a "scholarly," academic reputation

48. In terms of *your own personal satisfaction* while at college, how important do you expect the following items to be? *Check one* for each item.

	Important 1	Somewhat Important 2	Not Important 3
(53) Course work in general			
(54) Course work in field of major interest			
(55) Individual study or research			
(56) Getting acquainted with faculty members			
(57) "Bull-sessions" with fellow students			
(58) Student government			
(59) Off-campus politics			
(60) Athletics			
(61) Other student activities			
(62) Parties and social life			
(63) Individual artistic or literary work			
(64) Self-discovery, self-insight (discovery of new interests, talents, etc.)			

49. If you had to choose between making superior grades or engaging in a number of activities (see below) which would you choose? *Check one* in each pair.

(65) Grades ______ or ______ Participating in extra-curricular clubs, teams, interest groups, etc.
1 2
(66) Grades ______ or ______ Having as many dates as I want
(67) Grades ______ or ______ Having close friends on campus and spending as much time with them as I want.
(68-69) Grades ______ or ______ Expressing my true feelings, ideas, or knowledge even when they contradict the instructor's.

(73-79)
(80) 5

50. Indicate how you feel about the following statements by *checking one* for each item.

	Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Don't Know 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5
a) A person who is mature enough to go to college should have the freedom to make personal decisions about the use of the following:					
(1) Cigarettes					
(2) Alcohol					
(3) LSD					
(4) Marijuana					
b) There should be governmental (5) restrictions on the use of LSD					
c) A person who advocates un- (6) popular actions or holds unpopular ideas, no matter how extreme, should be allowed to speak to students on the college campus					
d) Present members of the Com- (7) munist Party should not be allowed to teach in colleges and universities					
e) Legislative committees should (8) investigate the political beliefs of university faculty members					
f) The war in Vietnam should (9) be supported and won at all costs					
g) Generally, it is hard for a per- (10) son over 30 to *really* understand the young person today					

51. Very rougly, what percentage of college students on this campus do you think have used the following at least once? Put a check in each column.

	"PEP" PILLS (Benzadrine, etc.) (11)		LSD (12)		MARIJUANA (13)
Less than 1%		1		1	
Less than 5%		2		2	
Less than 10%		3		3	
Less than 25%		4		4	
Less than 50%		5		5	
Less than 100%		6		6	

52. Do you feel that *homosexual* acts between consenting adults are immoral?

(14) 1 ______ Yes
2 ______ No
3 ______ No opinion

53. Generally, how do you feel about premarital sexual relations?

(15) 1 ______ Disapprove of premarital sexual intercourse
2 ______ All right for others, but not for myself
3 ______ Approve of premarital sexual intercourse
4 ______ No opinion

54. If student protest movements regarding the topics listed below were initiated on your campus during the current school year, what would be the most likely role that you would take in each? *Check one* for each of the following.

	Actively Involved 1	Contribute Funds 2	Sympathetic But Not Active 3	Neutral 4	Opposed to Movement 5
(16) Support of civil rights					
(17) Support of greater student involvement in determining campus policies					
(18) Opposition to the War in Vietnam					
(19) Opposition to dormitory regulations					

55. Which of the following most closely represents your thoughts and feelings about the Berkeley Free Speech Movement of 1964-65 and the participating students?

(20) 1 ______ Very much opposed and critical
2 ______ Somewhat opposed
3 ______ Neutral; no opinions or feelings
4 ______ Sympathetic and somewhat favorable
5 ______ Favorable and supportive
6 ______ Have not heard of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement

56. Indicate your status or opinion about the following groups.

	Member 1	Sympathetic 2	Neutral 3	Opposed 4	Don't Know 5
(21) CORE					
(22) SNCC					
(23) John Birch Society					
(24) Young Americans for Freedom					
(25) Young Democrats					
(26) Young Republicans					
(27) Young Socialist Alliance					
(28) Young People's Socialist League					

57. Should students participate significantly in the content and organization of courses, academic policy decisions, and matters of this sort?

(29) 1 ______ Yes
2 ______ No
3 ______ Maybe
4 ______ Don't know

58. Which of these statements comes closer to your own view?

(30) 1 ______ Students should be given very great freedom in choosing their subjects of study and in choosing their own areas of interest within those subjects.
2 ______ There is a body of knowledge to be learned, and the faculty is more competent than the student to direct the student's course of study, through required courses, prerequisites, and the like.

59. What was the highest educational attainment for each parent?

	Father (31) *Check one*		Mother (32) *Check one*
Grade school or some high school	______	1	______
High school diploma	______	2	______
Vocational or business school	______	3	______
Some college or junior college	______	4	______
Bachelor's degree	______	5	______
Some graduate or professional school (M.A. or less)	______	6	______
Higher graduate degree (Ph.D. or D.Sc.)	______	7	______
Higher professional degree [LL.B. (law), M.D. (medicine), D.D.S. (dentistry), Ed.D. (education), etc.]	______	8	______
Don't know	______	9	______

60. How do your parents feel about the amount of education they have received?

	Father (33) *Check one*		Mother (34) *Check one*
Fairly satisfied	______	1	______
Would have liked more	______	2	______
Deep regrets about not having more	______	3	______
Felt it was time wasted	______	4	______

61. Which of your grandparents have attended college? Check those who attended.

(35) 1 ______ Father's father
2 ______ Father's mother
3 ______ Mother's father
4 ______ Mother's mother
5 ______ None did
6 ______ Don't know

62. What approximate level of education do you think your parents hope you will attain?

	Father (36) *Check one*		Mother (37) *Check one*
High school diploma	______	1	______
Some college or junior college	______	2	______
Bachelor's degree	______	3	______
Some graduate or professional training	______	4	______
Higher graduate degree (Ph.D.or D.Sc.)	______	5	______
Higher professional degree [LL.B. (law), M.D. (medicine), D.D.S. (dentistry), Ed.D. (education), etc.]	______	6	______
Don't know	______	7	______

63. What is your father's specific occupation? State exactly what he does and the kind of place where he works: "sells clothes in a department store," "does chemical research for an oil company," etc. *If father is retired, deceased, or unemployed* describe his last occupation. *If you live with your stepfather* answer for him rather than your father.

(38-39)____
____
____

64. If your mother is or was employed, please describe your mother's occupation as you did for your father.

(40-41)____
____
____

65. If your mother is employed, what do you think are her primary reason(s) for working. If more than one reason applies, place a . . . "1" next to the *most important* reason, "2" next to the *second most important* reason.

(42-44) 1 ______ Commitment to a profession
2 ______ Enjoys working
3 ______ Financial reasons
4 ______ Would rather work than do housework

66. Please check your parents' combined, approximate yearly income. If deceased, what *was* their approximate income?

(45) 1 ______ Less than $5,000
2 ______ $5,000 - $7,500
3 ______ $7,500 - $10,000
4 ______ $10,000 - $15,000
5 ______ $15,000 - $20,000
6 ______ $20,000 - $25,000
7 ______ $25,000 - $30,000
8 ______ $30,000 and over
9 ______ Absolutely don't know

67. Which of the following is closest to the religious, ethical, and/or cultural values predominant in your family?

Check one

(46-47) 1 ______ Agnostic
2 ______ Atheist
3 ______ Catholic
4 ______ Eastern religion and/or philosophy.
Specify:________________________________
____
5 ______ Jewish. Specify subgroup:________________
6 ______ Protestant. Specify denomination:________________
7 ______ No formal religion
8 ______ No religious beliefs
9 ______ Other; Specify: ________________
____

68. Which of the following describes your present religious beliefs?

Check one

(48-49) 1 ______ Agnostic
2 ______ Atheist
3 ______ Catholic
4 ______ Eastern religion and/or philosophy.
Specify:________________________________
____
5 ______ Jewish. Specify subgroup:________________
6 ______ Protestant. Specify denomination:________________
7 ______ No formal religion
8 ______ No religious beliefs
9 ______ Other; Specify: ________________
____

69. How often do you and your parents attend formal church or synagogue services?

	Self (50) *Check one*		Father (51) *Check one*		Mother (52) *Check one*
More than once a week	______	1	______	1	______
Once a week	______	2	______	2	______
Once a month or so	______	3	______	3	______
Once or twice a year	______	4	______	4	______
Never or almost never	______	5	______	5	______

70. Regardless of immediate issues in politics, how do you usually think of yourself, your father and your mother — as a Republican, Democrat, or something else?

	Self (53) *Check one*		Father (54) *Check one*		Mother (55) *Check one*
Republican	______	1	______	1	______
Democrat	______	2	______	2	______
Independent	______	3	______	3	______
Socialist	______	4	______	4	______
Other; specify: ____________	______	5	______	5	______
____________________	______	6	______	6	______

71. From a political standpoint how would you describe yourself and your parents (even if deceased)?

	Self (56) *Check one*		Father (57) *Check one*		Mother (58) *Check one*
Very liberal	______	1	______	1	______
Liberal	______	2	______	2	______
Moderate	______	3	______	3	______
Conservative	______	4	______	4	______
Very conservative	______	5	______	5	______
Non-political	______	6	______	6	______
Don't know	______	7	______	7	______

72. Which of these phrases most nearly describes the high school from which you graduated?

(59-60) 1 ______ Public high school in a village or rural area
2 ______ Public high school in a small town (under 5,000)
3 ______ Public high school in a town of 5,000 - 20,000
4 ______ Public high school in a town or small city of 20,000 — under 100,000
5 ______ Public high school in a suburb
6 ______ Public high school in a city of 100,000 - 500,000
7 ______ Public high school in a city of 500,000 — under 1,000,000
8 ______ Public high school in a large city of 1,000,000 or more
9 ______ Private, non-sectarian high school; check if day school: ______
10 ______ Private, sectarian high school; check if day school: ______
(*Specify:* ______ Catholic; ______ Protestant; ______ Other.)

73. Which of the following is most in line with your educational plans for the next few years?

(61) 1 ______ Leave college before completing four years
2 ______ Transfer to another college or university before graduating
3 ______ Remain on this campus and graduate

74. What was your age on September 1, 1966?

(62) 1 ______ Under 17 years
2 ______ 17 years
3 ______ 18 years
4 ______ 19 years
5 ______ 20 years
6 ______ 21 years
7 ______ 22 and over
(73-79)
(80) 6

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

REFERENCES

Allport, G.W., Vernon, P.E., & Lindzey, G. *Study of values*. (Rev. ed.) Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Altbach, P. The student movement and the American university. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1966.

Argyris, C. *Organization and innovation*. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin and Dorsey Press, 1965.

Ashly, E. *Technology and the academics*. London: Macmillan, 1958.

Astin, A.W. *Who goes where to college*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1965.

Astin, A. W. *The college environment*. American Council of Education, 1968.

Astin, A. W. Undergraduate achievement and institutional quality. In *Inventory of current research on higher education, 1968*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Astin, A. and Holland, J. The distribution of wealth in higher education. *College and University*. Winter, 1962.

Axelrod, J. New organizational patterns in American colleges and universities. In American Council on Education, *Autonomy and interdependence: Emerging systems in higher education*. Washington, D.C. American Council on Education, 1964.

Axelrod, J. An experimental college model. *Educational Record*, Fall, 1967.

Axelrod, J. *New patterns in undergraduate education: Emerging curriculum models for the American college*. New Dimensions in Higher Education series. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, April, 1967.

Axelrod, J. New patterns in internal organizations. In L.B. Mayhew (Ed.), *Higher education in the revolutionary decade*. San Francisco: McCutchen, 1968.

Averill, L. J. *A strategy for the protestant college*. Philadelphia: Westminister, 1966.

Ayres, L.P. Seven great foundations. *Journal of Education*, 1910.

Ayres, L.P. History and present status of education measurements. *Seventeenth Yearbook* of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Bloomington: Public School Publishing, 1918.

Barnard, C. *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge: Harvard, 1942.

Barrett, H. G. *Innovation: The basis of cultural change*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.

Barrett, W. *Irrational man*. Garden City, N. J.: Doubleday, 1962.

Barth, J. *Giles goat-boy*. Garden City, N. J.: Doubleday, 1966.

Barth, J. *The floating opera*. New York: Avon, 1956.

Barton, A. H. *Studying the effects of college education: A methodological examination of changing values in college*. New Haven: Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1959.

Barton, A. *Organizational measurement and its bearing on the study of college environments*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1961.

Barton, A. *The college as a social organization*. New York: Columbia, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1963.

Barzum, J. *Teacher in America*. New York: Doubleday, 1953.

Bay, C. A social theory of higher education. In N. Sanford (Ed.), *The American college*. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Baskin, S. (Ed.). *Higher education: Some newer developments*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Becker, E. *Beyond alienation: A philosophy of education for the crisis of democracy*. New York: George Braziller, 1967.

Bell, D. *The reforming of general education*. New York: Columbia, 1966.

Binet-Simon. *A method of measuring the development of the intelligence of young children*. Chicago: Medical Book, 1915, (3rd. ed.).

Block, J., Hahn, N., & Smith, B. Activism and apathy in contemporary adolescents. In J. F. Adams (Ed.), *Understanding adolescence*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968.

Bloom, B. S. *Stability and change in human characteristics*. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Bolman, F. *How college presidents are chosen*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Boocock, S. Toward a sociology of learning: A selective review of existing research. *Sociology of Education*, 1966, *39*(1).

Booth, W. *The knowledge most worth having*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Boroff, D. Status seeking in academe. *Saturday Review*, December 19, 1964.

Boulding, K.E. Evidences for an administrative science. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1958, 3(1).

Boulding, K. E. *The impact of the social sciences*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1966.

Brameld, T. & Elan, S. (Eds.). *Values in American education*. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1964.

Bronowski, J. *Science and human values*. New York: Harpers, 1965.

Bronowski, J., et al. *Imagination and the university*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1963.

Brubacher, J. S. *Bases for policy in higher education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Buber, M. *Between man and man*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.

Burns, G. P. *Trustees in higher education*. New York: Independent College Fund, 1966.

Burns, T. & Stalker, G. W. *The management of innovation*. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1961.

Butterfield, E. W. The plenary inspiration of the dotted line. *Educational Review*, 1925, 68(2).

Butz, O. (Ed.). *To make a difference; A student look at America*. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Buxton, C. E. *A guide to college teaching*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1956.

Capen, S. P. *The management of universities*. Buffalo: Stewart and Foster, 1953.

Caplow, T. and McGee, R. J. *The academic marketplace*. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Carlson, R. O. *Adoption of educational innovations*. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1965.

Cartter, A. M. *An assessment of quality in graduate education*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

Cattell, J. M. *The psychological researches of J. M. Cattell by some of his pupils*. New York: Science, 1914.

Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. *Omnibus personality inventory: research manual*. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1967.

Cernmager, H., McEwen, R., & Blanchard, B. *Education in a free society, II.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1960.

Changing concepts of human nature. *American Scholar*, Winter, 1968-69.

Chapman, H. B. *Research in education with special reference to the Bureau of Educational Research*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1927, (Monograph No. 7).

Charters, W. W. & others. Bureau of educational research, 1932-33. *Educational Research Bulletin*, 1933, XII.

Chickering, A. W., et al. *Research and action: A project on student development at selected small colleges*. Washington, D. C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1968.

Chronicle of Higher Education, December 21, 1967, II(8).

Clark, B. R. The cooling out function in higher education. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1960, 5 (65).

Clark, B. R. *The open door college*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Clark, B. R. *Educating the expert society*. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Clark, B. R. The character of colleges: Some case studies. In R. J. Ingham (Ed.), *Institutional backgrounds of adult education: Dynamics of change in the modern university*. Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1966.

Clark, B. R. & Trow, M. A. Determinants of college subculture. In T. M Newcomb and E. K. Wilson (Eds.), *The study of college peer groups*. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.

Cole, C. C., Jr., & Lewis, L. G. *Flexibility in the undergraduate curriculum*. New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 13, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.

Columbia University Teachers College. *Character of education inquiry: Studies in the nature of character*, 3 volumes. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

Conant, J. B. *Shaping educational policy*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Cooper, D. School surveys. In C. W. Harris and M. Rhiba (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. (3rd ed.) New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Corson, J. J. Governance of colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Cowley, W. H. Some myths about professors, presidents and trustees. Teacher College Record, 1962, 64.

Crane, R. S. The idea of the humanities. Vol. I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Cross, K. P. Student values revisited. Research Reporter. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1968, 3(1).

Curti, M. & Nash R. Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965.

Davis, J. What college teachers value in students. College Board Review. Spring, 1965.

Dennis, L. E. & Kauffman, J. F. The college and the student. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

DeVane, W. C. Higher education in twentieth-century America. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Dewey, J. Control of universities. School and Society, 1915, 2.

Dodd, H. The academic president--educator or caretaker? New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Dostoyevsky, F. The brothers Karamazov. New York: Modern Library, 1950.

Dressel, P. L. Factors involved in changing the values of college students. Educational Record, 1965, 46(2).

Dressel, P. L. & Lehman, I. J. The impact of higher education in student attitudes, values, and critical thinking abilities. Educational Record, 1965, 46(3).

Dressel, P. L., & Lorimer, M. Attitudes of liberal arts faculty members toward liberal and professional education. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press, 1960.

Dressel, P. L., et al. Evaluation in higher education. Boston: Mifflin, 1961.

Durant, W. The story of philosophy. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1926.

Eddy, E. E. The college influence on student character. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

Eels, C. F. *Surveys of American higher education*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1939.

Eels, W. C. *Surveys of American higher education*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1937.

Ellul, J. *The technological society*. New York: Knopf, 1965.

Erikson, E. H. *Childhood and society*. (2nd ed.) New York: Norton, 1963.

Erikson, E. (Ed.). *The challenge of youth*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965.

Etzioni, A. Authority structure and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1959, 6.

Etzioni, A. *Modern organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Evans, R. I. *Resistance to innovation in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Feuer, L. The decline of freedom at Berkeley. *Atlantic Monthly*, 1966, 218.

Fletcher, J. *Situation ethics*. Philadelphia: Westminister, 1966.

Flexner, A. *Medical education in the United States and Canada*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910.

Franke, P. R. & Davis, R. A. Changing tendencies in educational research. *Journal of Educational Research*, 1931, XXIII.

Frankl, V. E. Dynamics, existence and values. *Journal of Existential Psychiatry*, Summer, 1961.

Frankl, V. *Man's search for meaning*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1963.

Freedman, M. B. *Impact of college*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1960.

Freedman, M. B. Changes in six decades of some attitudes and values held by educated women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1961, 17(1).

Freedman, M. B. Personality growth in the college years. *College Board Review*, 1965, 56.

Freedman, M. B. *The college experience*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Friedenberg, E. Z. *The vanishing adolescent*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.

Gaff, J. *Innovations and consequences: A study of Raymond College, University of the Pacific*. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1967.

Gardner, J. W. *Self-renewal*. New York: Harpers, 1964.

Gardner, J. W. *Agenda for the colleges and universities: Higher education in the innovative society*. New York: Academy for Educational Development, 1965.

Garnsworth, I. *Psychiatry, education, and the young adult*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles Thomas, 1966.

Glenny, L. A. *Autonomy of public colleges: The challenge of coordination*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Gogne, R. M. *The conditions of learning*. New York: Holt, 1965.

Good, C. V. Organized research in education: foundations, commissions, and committees. *Review of Educational Research*, 1939, IX(5).

Goodman, P. *Compulsory miseducation and the community of scholars*. New York: Vingate, 1964.

Gould, S. B. *Knowledge is not enough*. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1959.

Gouldner, A. W. Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1958, II(4).

Greeley, A. M. The teaching of moral wisdom. In G. K. Smith (Ed.), *Stress and campus response: Current issues in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Griffiths, D. C. Administrative theory and change in organizations. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), *Innovations in education*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia, 1964.

Griffiths, D. E. Research and theory in educational administration. In *Perspectives on educational administration and the behavioral sciences*. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1967.

Gross, E. & Grambsch, P. V. *University goals and academic power*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Gross, N. Organizational lag in American universities. *Harvard Education Review*, 1963, 33.

Gumperz, E. *The internationalizing of American higher education: Innovation and structural change*. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, in press.

Gusfield, J. and Riesman, D. Faculty culture and academic cancers: Some sources of innovation in higher education. Sociology of Education, 1964, Summer(4).

Gusfield, J. and Riesman, D. Innovation in higher education: Notes on student and faculty encounters in three new colleges. In H. Becker, et al., (Eds.), Institutions and the person: Essays in honor of E. C. Hughes. Chicago: Aldine, 1968.

Gustad, J. W. Community, consensus, and conflict. Educational Record, Fall, 1966.

Harris, C. W. (Ed.). Encyclopedia of educational research. New York: MacMillan, 1960.

Harris, S. E., et al (Eds.). Challenge and change in American education. San Francisco: McCutchan, 1965.

Harvard University Committee. General education in a free society. Cambridge: Harvard, 1945.

Hassenger, R. (Ed.). The shape of Catholic higher education. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1967.

Haswell, H. A. and Lindquist, C. B. Undergraduate curriculum patterns. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

Hatch, W. R. What standards do we raise? New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 12. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

Heath, S. J., Jr. The reasonable adventurer and others--a two-factor model of ego functioning. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1959, (6).

Heckman, D. and Martin, W. Inventory of current research on higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Heilbroner, R. L. The future as history. New York: Grove Press, 1961.

Heist, P. Intellect and commitment: the faces of discontent. In O. A. Knorr and W. J. Minter (Eds.), Order and freedom on the campus: The rights and responsibilities of faculty and students. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.

Heist, P. Higher education and human potentialities. In H. A. Otto (Ed.), Explanations in human potentialities. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1966.

Heist, P. Creative students: college transients. In P. Heist (Ed.), Education for creativity--a modern myth? Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1967. Also in P. Heist (Ed.), The creative college student: An unmet challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Heist, P. Personality and social theory basic to student development during the college years. Berkeley: Educational Testing Service and Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1968, mimeographed.

Henderson, A. D. The desired influence: Improving communication between administration and faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, June, 1967.

Henderson, A. D. Effective models of university governance. In G. K. Smith (Ed.), *In search of leaders: Current issues in higher education*. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Higher Education, 1967.

Henman, V. A. C.. The function, value and future of educational research in college and universities. *Journal of Educational Research*, March 1934, 27.

Heston, F. M. *Survey of college surveys*. Wilmore, Kentucky: Asbury College, 1934.

Hodgkinson, H. L. *Education, interaction and social change*. Inglewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Hodgkinson, H. L. Students and an intellectual community. *Educational Record*, 1968, 49(4).

Hofstadter, R. & Hardy, C. *The development and scope of higher education in the United States*. New York: Columbia, 1952.

Hofstadter, R. & Metzger, W. *The development of academic freedom in the United States*. New York: Columbia, 1955.

Holland, J. L. Undergraduate origins of American scientists. *Science*, 1957 (126).

Hollis, E. V. *Philanthropic foundations and higher education*. New York: Columbia University, 1938.

Howard, V. & Warrington, W. Inventory of beliefs: changes in beliefs and attitudes and academic success prediction. *Personnel Guidance Journal*, 1958, 27.

Howes, R. F. (Ed.). *Vision and purpose in higher education*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1962.

Hoyt, D. The relationship between college grades and adult achievement: A review of the literature. *American College Testing Research Reports*, No. 7. Iowa City: 1965.

Hughes, E., et al. Student culture and academic effort. In N. Sanford (Ed.), *The American college*. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Hungate, T. L. *Management in higher education*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, Teachers College, 1964.

Hutchins, R. *The university of utopia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Hyman, H. The value systems of different classes. In R. Bendix and M. Lipset (Eds.), *Class, status and power: A reader in social stratification*. Glencoe, Free Press, 1953.

Ingraham, M. H. *The mirror of brass: The compensation and working conditions of college and university administrators*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Jacobs, P. E. *Changing values in college*. New York: Harpers, 1957.

Jacobs, P. & Landan, S. *The new radicals*. New York: Vintage, 1966.

Jaspers, I. *The idea of the university*. Boston: Beacon, 1959.

Jencks, C. Social stratification and higher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1968, 38(2).

Jencks, C. & Riesman, D. *The academic revolution*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1968.

Johnson, S. W. Progressive changes in students' values, needs and educational objectives, Reports 1-6. Plattsburgh, N. Y.: State University College, June 1962-June 1963.

Katz, J. *Growth and constraint in college students*. Stanford: Institute for the Study of Human Problems, 1967

Kaufman, W. Educational development and normative philosophy. *Harvard Educational Review*. Summer, 1966.

Keeton, M. The climate of learning in college. *College and University Bulletin*. Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, November 15, 1962.

Keeton, M. *Future of the liberal arts college study*. Yellow Springs: Antioch, 1967, mimeographed papers..

Keeton, M. Governance study. Occasional papers, Antioch College, 1968.

Kelly, F. J. State university as an agency for research in education. *Transactions and proceedings*. Athens, Ohio: National association of State Universities, 1929.

Kelly, F. J. Contributions of research to higher education. In *Thirty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*. 1930.

Keniston, K. *The uncommitted*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

Kerr, C. *The uses of the university*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

King, S. H. Personality stability: Early findings of the Harvard study. Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association conference, 1967.

Klotsche, J. M. The urban university--and the future of our cities. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Knapp, R. H. & Goodrich, H. B. Origins of American scientists. New York: Russell & Russell, 1952.

Knapp, R. H. & Greenbaum, J. J. The younger American scholar: his collegiate origins. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Knight, D. M. The college as a community. The Christian Scholar, 1957, XL(2).

Koos, L. The junior college. Mineapolis: University of Minnesota, 1924.

Koos, L. V. & Crawford, C. C. College aims past and present. School and Society. 1921, 14.

Latz, J., et al. No time for youth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Lazarsfeld, P. F. & Sieber, S. D. Organizing educational research. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Lazarfeld, P. F. & Thielens, W. The academic mind. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958.

Learned, W. S. & Wood, B. D. The student and his knowledge. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin 29, 1938.

Lee, C. B. T. (Ed.) Improving college teaching. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Lehmann, I. H. Yardsticks for gauging values. University College Quarterly, 1966, 1.

Lehmann, I. J. & Payne, I. K. An explanation of attitude and value changes in college freshmen. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1963, 41.

Lenski, G. The religious factor: A sociological study of religious impact on politics, economics and family life. New York: Doubleday, 1961.

Lepansky, A. Administration. New York: Knopf, 1955.

Likert, R. New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Lipset, S. M. Political man. Garden City, N. J.: Doubleday, 1960.

Lipset, S. M. (Ed.). Student politics. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Lunsford, T. F. (Ed.). The study of academic administration. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Council on Higher Education, 1963.

Lunsford, T. F. Authority and ideology in the administered university. The American Behavioral Scientist, 1968, XI(5).

Lynd, L. The new radicals and participatory democracy. Dissent, 1965, 12.

Madge, J. The tools of social science. Garden City, N. J.: Doubleday, 1965.

Mallery, D. Ferment on the campus: An encounter with the new college generation. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

March, J. D. & Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Martin, W. B. The chance for educational change. Fordham Magazine, 1968, 3(1).

Martin, W. B. Alternative to irrelevance: A strategy for reform in higher education. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.

Martin, W. B. Education as intervention. Educational Record, 1969, 50(1).

Martin, W. and Heckman, D. Inventory of current research on higher education. New York: McGraw Hill, 1968.

Maslow, A. H. New knowledge in human values. New York: Harpers, 1959.

Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being. Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1962.

Mayhew, L. B. The smaller liberal arts college. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

McConnell, T. R. Change in scores on the Psychological Examination of the American Council in Education from freshman to senior year. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1934, 25.

McConnell, T. R. The function of leadership in academic institutions. Educational Record, 1968, 49(2).

McConnell, T. R. A general pattern for American public higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

McConnell, T. R. The attainment of individuality. In K. McFarland (Ed.), Urbanization and the college student: The social psychology of the future state metropolitan campus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1966.

McConnell, T. R. & Heist, P. Do students make the college? College and University, 1959, 34(4).

McConnell, T. R. & Heist, P. The diverse college student population. In N. Sanford, (Ed.), The American college. New York: Wiley, 1962.

McGrath, E. J. Control of higher education in America. Educational Record, 1936, 17.

McGrath, E. J. The liberal arts college and the emergent caste system. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1966.

McGrath, E. J. Universal higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

McGrath, E. J., & Hefferlin, J. B. Preliminary report--Study of institutional vitality. New York: Columbia University, Institute of Higher Education, 1967-69, mimeographed.

McGrath, E. J. & Hefferlin, L. Study of institutional vitality. New York: Teachers college, 1968, mimeographed.

McGree, R. The function of institutional inbreeding. American Journal of Sociology, 1960(65).

McGregor, D. Leadership and motivation. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1966.

McKeachie, W. J. New developments in teaching. In New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 16. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1967, mimeographed.

Medsker, L. L. The junior college: Progress and prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Meiklejohn, A. Freedom and the college. New York: Century, 1923.

Meyerson, M. The ethos of the American college student: beyond the protests. In R. Morrison (Ed.), The American university. Boston: Mifflin, 1966.

Miles, M. B. (Ed.). Innovation in education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Millett, J. D. The academic community. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Mills, C. W. The power elite. Oxford: Oxford University, 1956.

Miner, J. B. Conformity among university professors and business executives. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1962, June(7).

Minter, J. and Thompson, I. College and universities as agents of social change. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1968.

Moberly, Sir W. The crisis in the university. London: SCM Press, 1949.

Monroe, W. S., et al. Ten years of educational research, 1918-1927. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1928.

Mooney, R. L. A problem of leadership in the university. *Harvard Education Review*, 1963, Winter (33).

Morris, C. W. *Varieties of human value*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1956.

Morrison, J. C. The role of research in educational reconstruction. *The Forty-Fourth Yearbook*, Part II, *Structured reorganization*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1945.

Muscatine, C. (Chairman), *Education at Berkeley*. Berkeley: Select Committee on Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1966.

Nesbit, R. *The sociological tradition*. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Nevins, A. *The state universities and democracy*. Champaign: University of Illinois, 1962.

Newcomb, T. M. *Personality and social change: Attitude formation in a student community*. New York: Dryden, 1943.

Newcomb, T. M., et al. *Persistence and change*. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Newcomb, T. M. & Feldman, K. A. *The impact of college upon their students*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1968, mimeographed.

Newcomb, T. & Wilson, E. (Eds.). *College peer groups*. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.

Newfield, J. *A prophetic minority*. New York: New American Library, 1966.

Newman, J. H. *Idea of the university*. New York & London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1927.

Niebuhr, R. *Man's nature and his communities*. New York: Sciebners, 1965.

Organization and administration. *In Encyclopedia of education research*, (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Ortega y Gasset, J. *Mission of the university*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1944.

Pace, C. R. Five college environments. *College Board Review*, 1960(41).

Pace, C. R. Implications of differences in campus atmosphere for evaluation and planning of college programs. In R. L. Sutherland, et al (Eds.), *Personality factors on the college campus*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1962.

Pace, C. R. Methods in describing college cultures. *Teachers College Record*, 1962, January(63).

Pace, C. R. & Stern, G. G. An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics of college environments. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1958, 49.

Pace, C. R. & Stern, G. G. *A criterion study of college environment.* Syracuse: Psychological Research Center, Syracuse University, 1958.

Parkinson, C. N. *Parkinson's law and other studies in administration.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Parson, T. The problems of the theory of change. In W. Bennis, K. Berne and R. Chin, (Eds.), *The planning of change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Parsons, T. & Platt, G. *The academic profession: A pilot study*. Cambridge: Harvard, mimeographed preliminary report, 1968.

Patillo, M. M. & Mackenzie, D. M. *Church-sponsored higher education in the United States*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Patterson, F. & Longworth, C. L. *The making of a college: Plans for a new departure in higher education*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1966.

Pennsylvania College. *Pennsylvania study*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1918.

Perkins, J. A. *The university in transition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Peterson, R. E. *The scope of organized student protest in 1967-1968*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

Pfeiffer, J. *New look at education: Systems analysis in our schools and colleges*. New York: Odyssey, 1968.

Phi Delta Kappa *Research studies in education*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1962.

President's Commission on Higher Education. *Higher education for American democracy*, Vol. I *Establishing the goals*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. *Second report to the President*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1957.

Presthus, R. *The organizational society*. New York: Vintage, 1965.

Raushenbush, E. *The student and his studies*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1965.

Reeves, M. *Eighteen plus: Unity and diversity in higher education.* London: Faber and Faber, 1965.

Rice, J. M. The futility of the spelling grind. *Forum*, 1897(23).

Riesman, D. *Individualism reconsidered.* Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1954.

Riesman, D. *Constraint and variety in American education.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1958.

Riesman, D. Notes on new universities: British and American. *Universities Quarterly*, March, 1966.

Riesman, D. & Jencks, C. The viability of the American college. In N. Sanford (Ed.), *The American college.* New York: Wiley, 1962.

Rogers, E. M. *Diffusion of innovation.* New York: Free Press, 1962.

Rohman, G. Justin Morrill College, Michigan State University. In W. Hamlin and L. Porter (Eds.), *Dimensions of changes in higher education.* Yellow Springs, Ohio: Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education, 1967, Mimeographed.

Rokeach, M. (Ed.) *The open and closed mind.* New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rose, P. I. The myth of unanimity: Student opinions on critical issues. *Sociology of Education*, 1964(37).

Rosenberg, M. *Occupations and values.* Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.

Rossi, P. H. Researchers, scholars and polity-makers. *Daedalus*, Fall, 1964.

Rourke, F. E. & Brooks, G. E. *The managerial revolution in higher education.* Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Rudolph, F. *The American college and university.* New York: Knopf, 1962.

Russell, J. Remarks on personnel services. *Proceedings of the Institute of Administrative Offices of Higher Education*, 1940.

Sanford, N. Theories of higher education and the experimental college. In S. E. Harris (Ed.), *Higher education in the United States: The economic problems.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Sanford, N. Research and policy in higher education. In N. Sanford (Ed.), *The American college.* New York: Wiley, 1962.

Sanford, N. *Where colleges fail: A study of the student as a person.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Sanford, N. (Ed.) *The American college.* New York: Wiley, 1962.

Sartre, J. P. *Existentialism and human emotion.* New York: Philosophical Library, 1957.

Schein, E. H. & Bennis, W. G. *Personal and organizational change*. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Schiff, A. L. Innovation and administrative decision-making: A study of the conservation of land resources. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1966, 2(1).

Schon, D. *Technology and change*. New York: Delta, 1967.

Selden, W. K. *Accredition: The struggle over standards in higher education*. New York: Harpers, 1960.

Sherif, C. W., Sherif, M. & Nebergall, R. E. *Attitude and attitude change*. Philadelphia: W. Saunders, 1965.

Smelsen, N. J. *Theory of collective behavior*. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Smith, G. K. (Ed.). *Stress and campus response: Current issues in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Smith, H. *The purposes of higher education*. New York: Harpers, 1955.

Smith, J. E. *Value convictions and higher education*. New Haven: Hazen Foundation, 1959.

Snow, C. P. *The masters*. New York: Macmillan, 1951.

Sorokin, P. *Social and cultural dynamics*. (One vol. ed.) Boston: Porter Sargent, 1957.

Starr, R. *The beginnings of graduate education in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Stern, G. G. *Scoring instructions and college norms: Activities index, college characteristics index*. Syracuse, New York: Psychological Research Center, 1963.

Stickler, W. H. (Ed.). *Experimental colleges: Their role in American higher education*. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1964.

Stecklein, J. E. Research on faculty recruitment and motivation. In L. Wilson, et al. (Eds.), *Studies of college faculty*. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1961.

Stoke, H. *The American college president*. New York: Harpers, 1959.

Stroup, H. *Bureaucracy in higher education*. New York: Free Press, 1966.

Students and politics. *Daedalus*, 1968, 97(1).

Students for a Democratic Society. *The Port Huron statement*. New York: Students for a Democratic Society, 1964.

Swanson, J. W. The counter-university movement: In defense of the system. Journal of Higher Education, 1966, 57(7).

Taylor, F. The principles of scientific management. New York: Dutton, 1911.

Terman, L. M. The measurement of intelligence. New York: Mifflin, 1916.

Thompson, V. A. Bureaucracy and innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1965, June(10).

Thomson, F. A. College and university surveys. School and Society, June 23, 1917, 5.

Thorndike, E. L., et al. The measurement of intelligence. New York: Teachers College, 1927.

Thornton, J. W. The community junior college. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Trent, J. W. Catholics in college: Religious commitment and the intellectual life. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Tradition and change. Daedalus, 1966, 95(3).

Trent, J. W. & Craise, J. L. Commitment and conformity in the American college. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23(3).

Trent, J. W. & Medsker, L. L. Beyond high school. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1967. Also, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Trow, M. Social research and educational policy. In Research in higher education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1964.

University of Georgia, Journal of research and development in higher education: USOE-funded R and D centers. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia, 1968.

Van Doren, M. Liberal education. Boston: Beacon, 1959.

Veblen, T. The higher learning in America. New York: Fagamore, 1957.

Veysey, L. R. The emergence of the American university. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Vollmer, H. M. & Mills, D. L. (Eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Watson, G. Utopia and rebellion: The new college experiment. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Watts, W. A. & Whittaker, D. Some sociological differences between highly committed members of the Free Speech Movement and the student population at Berkeley. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, January-March, 1965, 33.

Webster, H., Freedman, M. B. & Heist, P. Personality changes in college students. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Weiss, J. The university as corporation. New University Thought. Summer, 1965, (4).

Whaley, R. M. Study of new and/or emerging institutions. Miscellaneous mimeographed reports. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Whitehead, A. N. Adventures of ideas. New York: Free Press, 1933.

Whitehead, A. N. The aims of education. New York: American Library, 1929, 1963.

Whitely, P. L. The consistency of personal values. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 1938, 33.

Whyte, W. H. Jr. The organization man. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

Williams, R. L. The administration of academic affairs. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Williamson, E. G. Student personnel services in college and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Wilson, J., Williams, N. & Sugarman, B. Introduction of moral education. Baltimore: Penguin, 1967.

Wilson, L. Basic premises for a national policy in higher education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1963.

Wilson, L. Academic man. New York: Octagon, 1964.

Wilson, L. Form and function in American higher education. Educational Record, 1964, 45(2).

Wilson, L. (Ed.). Emerging patterns in American higher education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Wilson, R. and Gaff, J. Studies of faculty characteristics and faculty influence on students. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education (in process).

Winthrop, H. Phenomenological and existential considerations surrounding the problem of values. Journal of Existential Psychiatry, Fall, 1961.

Wise, G. Integrated education in a dis-integrated world. Teachers College Record, 1966, 67(6).

Wise, M. They come for the best of reasons: College students today. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1958.

Wrightman, L. S. Bibliography of research on the philosophies of human nature scales. (Rev. ed.) Nashville: George Peabody College, 1968, mimeographed.

Wriston, H. M. Academic procession: Reflections of a college president. New York: Columbia, 1959.

Wundt's laboratory at Leipzig, 1879; Galton's anthropometric laboratory in London, 1882; Beaunis-Binet laboratory at the Sorbonne in 1889.

Young, M. The rise of the meritocracy, 1870-2033. New York: Random House, 1959.

Youth 1967--the challenge of change. American Scholar, 1967, 36(4).

Zweig, M. The idea of a world university. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967.